THE QUESTIONS Between the CONFORMIST AND Nonconformist,

Truly stated, and briefly discussed.

Dr. *FALKNER*, the *Friendly Debate*, &c. Examined and Answered.

Together with a Discourse about *Separation*, and some Animadversions upon Dr. *STILLINGFLEET's* Book, ENTITULED,

The Unreasonableness of Separation.

Observations upon Dr. *Templers* Sermon Preached at a Visitation in *Cambridge*.

A brief Vindication of Mr. *Stephen Marshal*.

BIBLIOTHECA COLL. SS. TRIN. JUXTA DUBLIN.

Sed hoc nimis doleo, quia multa quæ in Divinis libris saluberrima præcepta sunt, minus curantur, & tam multis præsumptionibus sic plena sunt omnia, ut gravius corripiatur qui per octavas suas terram nudo pede tetigerit, quam qui mentem Vinolentiæ sepelierit. August. Epist. 119.

Cum Apostolus testetur, mysterium hoc iniquitatis suo etiam tempore agi cœpisse, hinc intelligimus, opiniones omnes, & Traditiones, a Sacris Scripturis dissidentes quas Pontificis urgent, tanquam a Patribus acceptas, ad Apostasiam hanc, quam prædixit Apostolus, esse referendas. Downham de Antichrist. p. 151.

LONDON, Printed for *Tho. Cockerill* at the *Three Legs* in the Poultry, over against the *Stocks-Market*, 1681.

THE *Reader* may pleaſe to take notice, that this Diſcourſe was drawn up long before (now) Doctor *Falkner* took his Degree, elſe I had given him his Title. And ſo ſomething of Schiſm was ſpoke to before the Epiſtle to Dr. *Stillingfleet* could be written.

To the Reverend, and my much Honoured Brother, Dr. Edward Stillingfleet, *Dean of St.* Pauls.

SIR,

I Hope it is no offence unto you, though you be a *Dean*, that I call you *Brother*, ſince you have taught the Preſs how to ſpeak ſoberly and amicably, calling us *Diſſenting Brethren*; this is better language than *Sots*, *Rogues*, *Fools*, *Knaves*, *Rebels*, *Schiſmaticks*, which we read and hear from others. As for *Rebels*, if they be all Rebels that break the Kings Laws, I believe the King will have but a few loyal ſubjects. He hath Laws againſt *Drunkenneſs*, *Swearing*, *Whoring*, *Sabbath breaking*, and theſe are agreeable to the Law of God, (beſides Laws about Hares, Partridges, Pheaſants, and againſt *Papiſts*, *&c.*) we ſee men can live in oppoſition to theſe Laws, yet theſe are not called *Rebels*. But if the Laws of men concern the Houſe and Worſhip of God, concerning which God himſelf hath given us his own Laws, to which all Princes and men are bound, and unto which all their Laws ought to be conformable, (as we ſhall hear your ſelf ſpeak preſently) but that conformity we cannot ſee, and therefore dare not aſſent and conſent, *&c.* now we are called *Rebels*, *Schiſmaticks*, and what not? Thus it was in pious *Auguſtines* time, and this he complains of. Unreaſ. Separat. p. 62. Aug. Epiſt. 119.

Sir, ſpeaking of your Church, you tell us, *p.* 302. *Our Church is founded upon a Divine Rule*, viz. *the Holy Scriptures, which we own as the baſis and foundation of our faith; and according to which all other Rules of Order and Worſhip are to be agreeable.* 219. *Our Church requires a conformity to thoſe Rules which are appointed by it agreeable to the Word of God.*

Twice you tell us, *agreeable* to the Word of God; to which we agree alſo, this being the affirmative part of the ſecond Commandment, that all things in our worſhipping of him, be agreeable to his will and word.

Now, *Sir*, had you proved that all the things impoſed upon us had been *agreeable to the word of God*, you had put an end to this Controverſie. But though I honour and love you for the great ſervice you have done to the Church of Chriſt againſt the *Papiſts*, yet in proving the things Impoſed upon *us* to be *conformable* to the word of God, I

humbly conceive you fall very ſhort, therefore are we ſtill *Nonconformiſts*. Several things are impoſed upon us, but in your whole Book I find not *one* Scripture you produce to ſhew the agreement of them with it. Till then, our Separation is *reaſonable*.

That *Schiſm* is a great ſin, I agree with you, and wiſh Chriſtians were more convinced of it than I ſee they are. But the Queſtions are,

1. *What is ſchiſm?* 2. *Who is the cauſe of ſchiſm?*

For the *firſt*: Sir, I preſume you will grant that the *ſeparation* againſt which you preached, and now printed, do ſuppoſe, there was a union with that body from which you tell us we are now ſeparated. For how can there be a ſeparation from that to which we were not united?

Now, Sir, I think by what you have ſaid, to remove the *mighty ſtumbling-block* (as you call it, *pag.* 359.) of the *Croſs*, there will be found many thouſands in *England* who were never admitted into your Church, and if not admitted into it, then not united to it as *ſuch* a Church; no members of your body: how then can you charge them with this ſin of *ſeparation* from it?

Thus then, Sir, you ſpeak of the *Croſs in Baptiſm*, p. 351. when the Miniſter uſes theſe words *We receive this child into the congregation* ‘ *of Chriſts flock, and ſign him with the ſign of the Croſs, &c.* the Mi- ‘niſter now ſpeaks in the name of the Church, *We receive, &c.* then ‘follows *as the ſolemn rite of admiſſion, and do ſign him with the ſign of* ‘ *the Croſs*. All publick and ſolemn admiſſions into ſocieties, having ‘ſome peculiar *ceremony* belonging to them. And ſo as Baptiſm, beſides ‘its Sacramental efficacy, is a rite of admiſſion into Chriſts Catholick ‘Church, *ſo the ſign of the Croſs is into our Church of England*, in ‘which this Ceremony is uſed, without any preſcription to other ‘Churches. Thus you have interpreted the *Croſs*

Whether this will ſatisfie *Mr B* I leave it to him, it doth not me; the *Impoſers* of that Ceremony in their *Canons*, do not tell us that it is the *Rite of admiſſion into your Church* but *by this ceremony the Infant is dedicated to the ſervice of him that died upon the Croſs*. And that Book being of publick authority, muſt carry it.

I had thought that in our *Baptiſm* we had been *Dedicated to the Father, Son, and Spirit*. But it ſeems this is not enough, you annex to *his* words, *Another ſign to dedicate us to the ſervice of Chriſt that died upon the Croſs*. This, Sir, I hope you will prove to be *agreeable to the word of God*, as you told us, *your Impoſitions are*. I am very ignorant of the Text that proves it, and you have named none.

But this is not the thing I aim at; it is *your* interpretation I mind, and from it I gather, that you and all others who charge us with ſepa-

ration

ration from your Church, muſt prove, *That we were received, and that by this rite of admiſſion* (the Croſs) *into your Church, which you call the Church of England.* This is clear from your own Interpretation, and alſo from the *page* before 350, where you illuſtrate it from the *Independent* Churches; Thus,

Suppoſe, ſay you, *an adult perſon to be baptized, and immediately after Baptiſm to be admitted a member of an* Independent Church, *and the ceremony of this admiſſion to be*, holding up of the hand, *in token of his owning the* Church-Covenant, *&c.*

Now, Sir, let me ſuppoſe (as you do ſuppoſe) that the Paſtors of the *Independent* Churches ſhould baptize ſeveral perſons, but never admit them into their Churches, by this *ceremony of holding up the hand*; let them baptize many thouſands, and theſe thouſands chuſe other Paſtors who are rightly qualified, and ordained by Prayer, Faſting, and Impoſition of hands of the Elderſhip: The *Independents* cannot charge theſe Churches with *ſchiſm*, and *ſeparation* from their Churches, for they never admitted them by that *ceremony and rite of Admiſſion*, of *holding up the hand* into their Churches.

Now, Sir, apply it; for about twenty years there was publick Baptiſm adminiſtred, but not by your Liturgy, much leſs with the *Croſs*. How many thouſands do you think in the ſpace of ſo many years may be baptized, none of theſe were ever admitted into your Church by thoſe words, *We receive this child, &c. and ſign him with the ſign of the croſs*. But of many ſuch do our Congregations conſiſt, who were never *your members*; why then do you call them *ſeparatiſts* from you?

Beſides, Sir, your Liturgy admits of *private Baptiſm*, and then no ſuch admiſſion by the Croſs, and abundance have been thus baptized without it, to my knowledg.

For my own particular, I cannot tell whither I was ſo admitted, my Parents never told me ſo; and for my godly Father I am ſure he hated humane inventions in the Worſhip of God. I was born, they told me, in winter-time, extream for cold, the houſe half a mile from Church, and I being their only Son at that time, it's a queſtion whether they would carry me forth in ſuch an extream cold ſeaſon ſo far. As for the *Church-Regiſter*, that (nor any other that ever I ſaw) ſpecifies nothing of my being *admitted into your Church by the Croſs*; but only of my being baptized; but that, ſay you, (and truly) is into the Catholick Church. No *Regiſters* then recording, who were ſo admitted, it will be hard matter for theſe who are ancient to prove their admiſſion into your Church; and if we were not, I know not how we can now be admitted. For this *Rite of Admiſſion* is uſed only at *Baptiſm*, unleſs we will yield to be *Rebaptized*, and ſo to be admitted by the *Croſs*, this you will not admit no more than we.

We

We read of the Apoſtles admitting of many believers, *God added to the Church*, Act. 2. *ult.* but never that they uſed this rite of admiſſion, *the ſign of the Croſs*; only this is our happineſs, we are more wiſe, more holy, greater lovers of Chriſt, than ever the Apoſtles were, (though we profeſs we are *built upon the foundation of Apoſtles and Prophets*, Epheſ. 2. 20.) that their examples are too low for us.

Beſides, Sir, is it not meet that when children come to years of diſcretion they ſhould then be called before the Church to declare whether they own their *Baptiſmal Covenant*, and alſo their *admiſſion into the Church* they are reputed members of, as you ſay, the *Independents* require their Children to own the *Church-Covenant*? let them now be members of the Church by their *own conſent*. Truly, Sir, if it come to that, ſince we read what your *Canons* ſay of the Croſs, and how it is abuſed in *Popery*, and how ſtrange this is to the *Apoſtolical admiſſion*, we ſhould not like it.

But are not children members of the ſame Churches with their Parents? though we think ſo, yet this is nothing to the practiſe of your Church. For as in your adminiſtration of Baptiſm, the *Parental Covenant*, (*Abraham* and his ſeed) which is the ground of the Adminiſtration, is wholly omitted; ſo the *Parent* he muſt ſtand by as if he were a Heathen; the buſineſs is only with the *God-fathers*, and *God-mothers*, an invention of *Higinus* Biſhop of *Rome*, about 144 years after Chriſt, who firſt added theſe to Baptiſm; a perſon of no great worth, of whom it is ſaid, *Nihil præclari, de gubernatione, & factis ejus commemorari poteſt*. So much cauſe have I to beg pardon for my defects in the education of my own Children, that I would not be *Sponſor* for the child of the beſt friend I have in *England*. But however this is not it, but the *ſign of the Croſs, with ſuch words*, that makes the admiſſion into your Church.

2. *Q.* But if there be a Separation, or Schiſm, the queſtion is, who is the cauſe of it?

A. *Schiſm muſt needs be theirs, whoſe the cauſe of it is*, ſaith Biſhop *Laud*, in which you juſtifie him, *Ration. Account*, p. 324, 325.

I humbly conceive, that whoever impoſes other terms of Communion than Chriſt hath impoſed, he or they are the cauſe of the *ſchiſm*. *We do not*, ſay you, *neceſſarily ſeparate from all Churches that have errors or corruptions in them, ſuppoſing thoſe errors and corruptions be not impoſed on us as conditions of communion*, Ibid. p. 332.

I pray do not think that we ſuppoſe you impoſe ſuch groſs things upon us, as *Rome* impoſed on you: No, Sir, we bleſs God for that great advance which was made by our firſt Reformers. But whereas you

you ſay you retain only ſuch innocent Ceremonies which were in uſe before the Papal power grew to that height:

I pray, *firſt*, are you ſure that *All* the Churches did uſe them? 2. Did they uſe *all* that are impoſed on us? I know they uſed others; but did they uſe to tye up their Miniſters to ſuch ſyllables in prayer, or elſe muſt not pray? Did they kneel at the Lords-Supper? we know the contrary, *&c.* 3. Did they *impoſe* theſe as conditions of Communion? But grant there were ſuch Ceremonies, and other things as now impoſed upon us, I will ſay of them, what Biſhop *Downham* ſaith *of the opinions and traditions differing from the holy Scriptures, which the Pontificians ſay were received of the Fathers, they are to be referred to that Apoſtaſie the Apoſtle foretold, 2 Theſ. 2. 3. when he ſaid the myſtery of iniquity already worketh, v. 7.* Downh. de Antichriſto, p. 151.

And I pray, Sir, ſince the examples and practiſes of thoſe Churches, are made ſo much uſe of againſt us, let me give you my thoughts in a ſimilitude of your own.

In your Epiſtle to your *Rational Account, &c.* dedicated to the King, you tell his Majeſty, *that the Church of England in the late confuſions ſuffered an Eclipſe, but ſince his Majeſties Reſtauration ſhe hath recovered her luſter, &c.*

Sir, we obſerve when the Sun riſeth, it doth not ſuddenly go into an Eclipſe, but gradually, ſo that common people do not mind it until the light of it be ſenſibly obſcured; ſo, nor doth it come out of its Eclipſe ſuddenly at once, but gradually; but it will not ceaſe its motion till it appears in its glory. It is the ſame with the Goſpel-Church, it did not preſently, ſuddenly fall into that dark Eclipſe, which it ſuffered under the Antichriſtian Papal power, but it got into it by degrees, the Churches not diſcerning it; *the myſtery of iniquity wrought*, it is no fancy of mine, but the Apoſtles expreſs words. The *ſubtil ſerpent*, he wrought among the Churches under *fair pretences*; in the ſecond Century ſome addition made to *Worſhip* and *Government* of the Church; in the third Century more; in the fourth Century more; ſo increaſed the Eclipſe, ſtill under fair reaſons, till the Serpent had got the *man of ſin* into his Throne, and the Prediction fulfilled. So hath the Churches coming out of the Eclipſe been but gradual, in *Doctrine, Government, Worſhip*, by our worthy Reformers; but as the evil ſpirit deceived then, by Gods permiſſion, to bring about the Propheſie; ſo the Spirit of Chriſt in the hearts of our firſt Reformers wrought powerfully, and ſo doth the ſame Spirit *ſtill* work, and *will* work, till the Church be quite out of her Eclipſe, and comes to be ſatisfied with the *Soveraignty* and *Wiſdom* of Chriſt declared in the *ſimplicity* of the Goſpel; let men call it *ſchiſm, fanaticiſm*, or what they pleaſe.

But,

But, Sir, you tell us of Mr. *Ball*, Mr. *Hilderſham*, Mr. *Giffard*, &c. worthy men, (I grant they were ſo, and honour them much) and Non-conformiſts, who condemned Separation from your Church, and no more was impoſed than in their time, and this takes up a great part of your Book.

Sir, while ſome excellent men at home conformed, but groaned under the burden, (as I remember Mr. *John Rogers* of *Dedham*, an eminent Saint, though he did conform, I never ſaw him wear a Surplice, nor heard him uſe but a few prayers, and thoſe I think he ſaid *Memoriter*, not read them; but this he would do in his Preaching, draw his finger about his throat and ſay, *Let them take me and hang me up, ſo they will but remove theſe ſtumbling-blocks out of the Church.*) How many thouſands of choice Chriſtians, plucked up their ſtakes here, forſook their dear friends and native Country, ſhut up themſelves in Ships (to whom a priſon for the time had been more elegible) went remote into a howling Wilderneſs, there underwent great hardſhips, water was their common drink, and glad if they might have had but that which they had given at their doors here (many of them); and all this ſuffering was to avoid your Impoſitions, and that they might dwell in the Houſe of God, and enjoy all things therein according to his own appointment. But what cared your Church for this; let Gods people groan at home, ſuffer abroad, they ſhall do it rather than your Church will part with a few *trifles*, as your own Mr. *Carre* calls the *ceremonies*. Sir, is this the ſpirit of the true Spouſe of Chriſt? But as I ſaid, the ſame Spirit will work which acted thoſe holy men, till the Church be totally out of her Eclipſe, what ever thoſe worthy men you mention have ſaid.

But to ſpeak more cloſe, I deny that the ſtate of your Church *now*, is the ſame it was *then*, when theſe worthy men condemned Separation from it. For,

1. There are many thouſands now in *England*, who were never admitted into *your* Church, were never members of it; then they could not condemn theſe as Separatiſts from it. This I have proved before from your Interpretation of the *ſign of the Croſs*. It was not ſo in their time.

2. The Liturgy and the Homilies were *then* brought in out of *neceſſity*, becauſe of the *want of gifts*; now it is impoſed in *ſcorn* and oppoſition of *gifts*. By what ſome of your Arch-deacons have ſpoken in your Courts, and others, we can conclude no other, than it was compoſed to bring over the *Papiſts* to your Church, and for ſeveral years the *Papiſts* did frequent your Divine Service; but now it was impoſed with ſuch words (as in my next) that it was made an engine to turn

Proteſtants

Proteſtants out of your Church. A Member of that Parliament that made the Act for *Uniformity*, viſiting his Siſter, a Lady (who told it me) related to her what they were about; ſhe diſliked their Act, and told him, *I ſee then you are laying a ſnare in the gate.* *Ay*, ſaid he, *if we can find any way to catch the Rogues, we will have them.*

3. Then they were not required to *aſſent* and *conſent*, *&c.* but now it is impoſed with theſe terms; and I am confident that divers who have ſubſcribed with theſe terms, do but lye.

4. 'Tis true we have the ſame 39 Articles, that was before; and thoſe Articles were aſſented to, and aſſent required in that Church. But now *you* have told the world that Biſhop *Bramhall* gives the ſenſe of the Church of *England* thus: viz. *She does not define any of theſe Queſtions as neceſſary to be believed, &c. Neither do we look upon them as Eſſentials of ſaving faith, &c. Neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them.* And this is the opinion of the Grandees in *this your* Church; this would have been abhor'd before. Rational Account, p. 54. 55.

5. As thoſe 39 Articles were believed by that Clergy, ſo they did defend them, and Preached them; but this Clergy can both print and preach againſt them, I mean the great and ſound Doctrines in them, (I do not ſay all of them.) I put the queſtion to one of your Clergy, and asked him in earneſt what he thought *of this Clergy* as to the Doctrine of the Church of *England* contained in theſe Articles? he anſwered me, *Divide them into three parts, he thought two of the three were fallen from it.*

6. In that Church there were abundance of godly plain-hearted Miniſters, whoſe Religion was not confined to a Pulpit, but walked among their people as became Miniſters, ſeeking the good of their ſouls. I deny not but God hath ſome ſuch now; but for the generality of them, I ſay nothing my ſelf, only I can tell you what others have ſaid. A learned and pious Divine, ſo far a friend to Conformity, that I doubt not but he hath ſubſcribed; he told me, Though your Church would give him a Living, he would not take it, becauſe he would not have ſuch an occaſion to bring him among your Clergy. And diſcourſing with another of your Clergy, (whom for learning, wit and piety, I do honour) about Mr. *A*'s Book, and his Dialect, which you call *uncomely writing*, ſaid he, *Truly we have ſuch a frothy, vain Clergy, gone off from that ſolidity and gravity that become Divine things, that if Books come not out in this dreſs, they will but ſcorn them; but in that Book, beſides wit, there is good matter.* Pridentem dicere verum, *&c.* This was his ſenſe of *Mr. A*'s Book.

But, Sir, if ſuch as theſe be thruſt upon us, muſt we own them for our *Miniſters?* What, Sir, will you deny the peoples power of Electi-

on, which the *Papists* grant the people had till *Charles* the Great, or till *Lewis* his Son, about 830 years? See, I pray, *Pamelius* his Annotations upon theſe words of *Cyprian*, Epiſt. 68. *Quando ipſa (plebs) maxime habeat poteſtatem vel eligendi dignos ſacerdotes, vel indignos recuſandi.* How could a man write plainer for the peoples power of Election? But our Proteſtants tell us, that only from the time of *Frederick* the ſecond, who died *Ann.* 1250, or thereabout, were the people excluded from the power of chuſing Paſtors, and it was the deed of *Gregory* the ninth, as *Krantzius* reporteth.

7. That Church did believe and prove the *Pope*, *&c.* to be the Antichriſt, *Rome-chriſtian* to be the Whore, *Apoc.* 17. thus the Biſhops, and our Profeſſors of Divinity, *&c.* but I can meet but with very few of *this* Church of that opinion. Dr. *Hammond* the Oracle of this new Edition of the Clergy, cannot find him in the 2 *Theſ.* 2. nor in *Apoc.* 17. the Pope is an honeſt man with him. Biſhop *Bramhall* tells us, *Our conteſt is not with the Church of* Rome, *but the Court of* Rome. I find that you have declared: 1. *That the Church of* Rome *is a true Church.* 2. *That they retain the fundamentals of Religion.* 3. *That ſalvation is to be had in the Church of Rome.* Lay all together, here is a fair Bridg laid to go over to *Rome*. To ſay, that God hath his people under the Juriſdiction of *Rome*, is one thing, *Apoc.* 18.4. but to ſay the Church of *Rome* is a true Church, is another thing; a *Wife* and a *Whore* differ.

8. In *that* Church *Re-ordination* to the ſame office was never heard of, but exploded, as it is in all Churches elſe; but in *this* Church it is impoſed.

9. There was no Oath taken, nor Covenant made with the great God, to reform the Houſe of God, in *Doctrine*, *Worſhip*, and *Diſcipline*, according to the word of God; this ought to be, though the Covenant had not been made; had the things impoſed been according to the Word of God, this Covenant had bound us to them; that Covenant will not be beaten out of the hearts of them, *who know God*, and *fear an Oath*, what ever other perſons make of it; the leaſt then men can do, is to abſtain from thoſe things which were once caſt out, as being unconformable to the word of God; and ſhall thoſe people have no Ordinances for fear of a *ſeparation?*

10. In *that* Church, *Quakers* were not known; but under *this* Church they ſwarm, that raze the foundation, and deſtroy all Goſpel-ordinances. And many people being offended with your impoſitions, and diſguſted with your Clergy, lay in great danger of being carried away with them; and I doubt not abundance had gone, but that by our Preaching and adminiſtring all Ordinances, they have been kept

kept close to Gospel truths, Gospel ordinances, and Gospel ministry. The *Quakers* and *Papists* are not so hated by your Clergy, as we are.

From all which I conclude the Cause is not the same; and had Mr. *Ball*, Mr. *Hildersham*, *&c.* been living in our days, they would, I doubt not, have done as we do.

But then we are charged with bringing in of *Popery*, and this takes up several leafs of your *Preface*.

Heylin (one of yours) tells us indeed, *I perswade my self, had the Reformed party abroad continued an allowable correspondence in some circumstances with the* Romish *Church, as the Church of* England *doth now, it had been far greater, and less stomacked; and this was the censure of Monsieur* de Rhosny, *when he observed the Majesty and decency of our Church-service in our Cathedrals.* Geograp. in Quarto Edit. pag. 470.

On the other side, *Harding*, *Bristow*, and *Carrier*, seducing Jesuits, assured themselves that they might yet convert *England* to the Catholick Church, whose Service and Ceremonies she yet retained. Nor do I see any such alteration made in this Edition, but if Pope *Pius* the *4th.* and *Gregory* the *13th.* offered to confirm the former, and the Council of *Trent*, affirmed they might do it, then the Pope may do this, for ought I know.

But how do we bring in *Popery?* you tell us out of Bishop *Sanderson*, the first way is, *by pulling down Episcopacy*, *&c.* Pref. p 7.

But, Sir, *Bishops* are restored, and you tell the King the Church of *England* is out of her Eclipse; that she shines in a firmament above her Adversaries: I pray, Sir, what is the matter that *now* Popery is coming in as a flood upon us? cannot these *Bishops*, the *English* Banks, keep it out? I say nothing how strongly they act in Parliament against it, the Kingdom talk enough of it.

I pray, Sir, tell us what have you Conformists done more against Popery than the *Dissenters* have done?

1. Have you prayed earnestly against it? so have we.

2. Have you Preached against it? so have we.

3. Have you Printed against it (as you have done excellently, and we thank you for it) so have ours. The first Book I saw was *Fiat Lux*. I saw a second Impression, and wondered I heard of no answer from your Church; Dr. *Owen* was the man that answered it, *Ann.* 1662. so long *ours* have appeared.

4. Have your Clergy kept their monthly Fasts four or five years, foreseeing what now is coming upon us (if God prevent it not)? so have several of our Ministers, with the hazard of our Estates and Persons by *Informers*, from whom you were free.

5. Did you the laſt year (at leaſt for the chief part of the year), beſide your family-prayers, ſet a part ſometime between ſix and ſeven in the morning one day in the week, to pray purpoſely that God would deliver this Nation from theſe bloody Papiſts, and their curſed Idolatry, and Doctrines? *&c.* ſo have we in ſeveral Counties, and layed the ſame charge on our people.

6. Do you think you ſhall be put to defend our Legal right to the Proteſtant Religion by what I am loth to mention, the ſword)? ſince the *Lollards-Tower*, the *Biſhops* Cole-houſe, *&c.* are out of date, they are too thirſty, and muſt have larger draughts. I believe there will be no diſtinction then between a true Proteſtant Conformiſt, and us, therefore we muſt join with you.

Why then do you charge us with bringing in of Popery? I deſire your Church would not put us upon temptation; we wrong them not in their Tythes, but charge our people to pay them exactly; and do not grudg us the little that we have to bring us in bread. I thank God I am not very lazy in my place, but if you will give me twelve pound *per Annum* for my ſtipend, you ſhall have it, and thank you too. But I bleſs God I may work for ſo good a Maſter.

A little more as to our Communion with your Church: Sir, ſome of us have lived in Gods Houſe, where we ſaw the Government hath been carried on by Officers of his own appointment, according to his own Rule, and what a *majeſty* have we beheld in it! Admonitions, firſt privately, then publickly by the Elders, continuing in this courſe of admoniſhing, to try if they could bring to repentance, ſometimes longer, ſometimes ſhorter, as the ſin hath been, and they in prudence ſaw reaſons. (I have known them waſte half a year in this courſe) When nothing would do, but they muſt come to *Excommunication*, how wiſely did they govern the Brethren to bring them to declare their conſent * *obedientially* to their Elders, (for they deny the Government to be *Democratical*; nor will I own the *Fraternity to be the firſt ſubject of the Keys. In the beginning it was not ſo*, as our Lord ſaid in another caſe, *Mat.* 19. 8. and to the beginning we muſt go) and your * *Thorndike* ſpeaks excellently to this, why the Congregation ought to be concern'd in this. Now when all were agreed, how dreadful was the ſentence! what pale faces! how many tears did it cauſe in the Congregation! a ſolemn ſight to behold the Church putting the perſon out of the Congregation, *Terrible as an army of banners*, *Cant.* 6. 10. I have often thought of the Text ſince. After this, how excellently did the Church walk towards an Excommunicate perſon, to bring to Repentance? And what rare effects have I known of this Ordinance, without any Writs *de Excommunicato capiendo*; alas theſe could

* 2 Cor. 10. 6.

* Primit. Government of Church. p. 147.

could never effect what I have known, to the humbling of such a person. And now, Sir, do you think that we who have seen these things, can join with your Church, where this Ordinance so *majestical*, so *terrible*, is so horribly profaned? I pray, Sir, pardon me though I stand off from it. But I pray, Sir, why do your *Bishops* excommunicate those who were never of your Church? why do they not Excommunicate the *French*, or *Dutch*? True, they live under your Laws, but your Law is, they must be admitted by the *Cross*, and being Infants, could not help it.

As to your Discourse about *particular Congregations*, and *Diocesan Churches*, it is not my purpose to meddle with it; only I desire you to tell me why a Pastor of a single Congregation may not be as fit to govern that Congregation, as your single Bishop to govern a thousand Congregations, as it is with your Church? where did the Apostles ordain, but one single Pastor to a Church? we have eight Churches recorded in the Epistles, and the *Acts*, but we read in them all several Elders to carry on Church-work. As for *Timothy* and *Titus*, being Bishops in our controverted sense, enough hath been said about them. Strange that we should have twelve Apostles beside *Paul* and *Barnabas*, many Elders and several Evangelists, and but *two* Bishops (who were Evangelists too) recorded in holy Writ to be the pattern for the succeeding Bishops; when, where, and how, those *two* were made Bishops, we cannot find.

And for the large Dioceses, so large, that 'tis impossible for a *Bishop* to perform the Duties the Lord requires of a Pastor to one quarter of the Dioceſs: The Petitioners for Reformation in King *James*'s reign, tell his Majesty, That in *Augustine*'s time there were in one Province under *Carthage*, of the *Catholick* and *Donatist*, Bishops above nine hundred. Of the *Catholicks* part there were present 286, and absent 120 by reason of sickness and old age, Episcopal Churches void 60, in all 466. Of the *Donatists* there were present 279, absent 120, Churches void 60, in all 459. These come near the matter, make him but *Episcopus præses*, and as to Officers and Churches I may come to agree with you, leaving my brethren to their judgments. Pag. 203.

Several other things I took notice of in your Book that may easily be answered; as the *perplexing scruples* you mention, *pag.* 384, 385. (*If we must baptize only by the Parents right*) that men must run into. No, none at all.

But, Sir, did you not forget your self very much, *p.* 393. when you tell us the differences between the Popish Ceremonies, and your Ceremonies? viz. *That yours are appointed only for decency and order*? Sir, do not your Preface to your Ceremonies tell us another story, *viz.* of

a sig-

a ſignificacy in them to put us in mind of our duty? 2. Of an *aptneſs in them to ſtir up our dull minds to our duty?* Here is ſome *efficacy* in them to help to the performance of duty, ſtirring up dull minds; theſe do not much differ from the *efficacy* you ſay the *Papiſts* give to theirs for the purging *away ſome ſorts of ſins*. I think both alike.

As for your *French* Letters; who told *le Moyne* what he writes *pag.* 404. *That we believe that a man cannot be ſaved in the Church of England?* I never heard ſuch a word from any Diſſenter, nor ever had I ſuch a thought. Certainly none of our Biſhops would write ſuch a line to him. So that this muſt be the figment of a *French* mans brain, which we abhor; for the ſtory he writes, *p.* 409. of a *Nonconformiſt* that he heard preach; I could tell him a ſtory of one of our late Biſhops ten times worſe, but the Preſs ſhall not know it; but you ſhall.

Sir, I have given you a few of my thoughts, reading over your Book, while my Papers were in the Preſs, (which have lain by me ſeveral years) and muſt tell you I am not yet ſatisfied with the title of your Book, *viz.* the *Unreaſonableneſs of Separation*, &c. To your Prayer in the end of your *Preface*, I heartily ſay, *Amen, Amen.*

SIR,

I am your Servant to love and honour You,

G. F.

THE

THE QUESTIONS Between the CONFORMIST AND Nonconformiſt,

Truly ſtated, and briefly diſcuſſed.

IT was not without the ordering of Divine Providence that the day which the Imitators of the Heathens Ἀποβόησις, did conſecrate to their St. *Bartholomew*, ſhould be the day on which the blood of ſo many thouſand Proteſtants was poured out in *France*, and the day alſo on which ſo many hundreds of Goſpel-Miniſters, to whom Chriſt had given both will and skill for his work, ſucceſs in his work, were turned out of his work in *England*. The crime both there and here which they found, was the ſame the Princes found againſt *Daniel* in the Law of his God. A day of gladneſs it was to many, but not to all upon the ſame ground. One Conformiſt, and a man of note, tells a Captain under his Majeſty, ſince his Return, that he was glad ſo many Miniſters refuſed to conform; the Captain would know his reaſon: he gives it thus: *Had all Miniſters conformed, people would have thought there was nothing in Religion, only a thing to talk of in the Pulpit, and ſerve a State-deſign, for theſe Miniſters will turn any way the State turn: But by their giving up their livings,*

vings, and expoſing themſelves and families to outward evils, rather than they would conform to things impoſed not agreeable (as they apprehended) to the Goſpel they preached, they have convinced men there is reality in Religion, and given a check to Atheiſm. This was the ſubſtance; and to be ſure he was not more glad than I was, when the Captain told me his Diſcourſe.

How zealous yet ſome have been to bring us over to Conformity, the many Books publiſhed for it, and againſt us, have declared. Some of which have come to my hand, but all were not written with the ſame Spirit. As they came to hand, ſo I peruſed them, to ſee if I could find any thing to convince me. And whereas there are five things impoſed upon us, 1. The Liturgy, with ſtinted forms of prayer. 2. Myſtical Ceremonies. 3. Subjection to *ſuch* Epiſcopacy. 4. Re-ordination. 5. Renouncing the Covenant. I applied my ſelf to the three firſt Queſtions chiefly. For if it can be proved that theſe are *agreeable with*, and *conformable* to the Laws of God, as the *Friendly Debate*, and Dr. *Templer*, would perſwade their Readers, then Re-ordination may be admitted, and the Covenant renounced.

As to the two firſt Queſt. Mr. *Carre* was the firſt man I met with that argued for them; after him I met with the *Friendly Debate*; next, with the *Serious and compaſſionate Enquiry, &c.* (Dr. *Goodman*, the Author as I hear, *Nemine contradicente*), but laſt of Mr. *Falkner*, a man of an excellent ſpirit, whom I ſhall honour, and one that hath ſaid more than all before. Before he came forth, I had drawn up my anſwer to all the former, and was loth to throw away all I had done, becauſe I ſaw there were ſome things in theſe Authors which Mr. *Falkner* had not, elſe I would wholly have attended him; but where I ſaw they all agreed, there I conſidered them conjunct; where one had what the other had not, there ſeverally.

As to the third Queſt. ſomething I found in a piece Entituled *Samaritaniſm*. As to the Learned Dr. *Stillingfleet*, by throwing down the *Jus Divinum* of any form of Church Government, he prepared the way for our ſubjection to ſuch *Epiſcopacy*, if his principle be ſound.

For the *ſerious and compaſſionate Enquiry*, I found little in that piece as to our queſtions, unleſs a man were ſo ſimple to take fine words for ſtrong arguments, and Rhetorick for Logick. For his Diſcourſe about *ſchiſm*, I ſhall conſider it in its place. But the chief things I obſerved in him, were his odious compariſons between the Conformiſt and Nonconformiſt, begun at *p.* 21. and continued ſome *pages*. His ſlighting that worthy Father bleſſed *Auſtin*; the contempt he throws upon the Synod of *Dort*, which I did never expect from the pen of a Son of the Church of *England*. But I ſee this Church of *England*, and the famous

famous Church of *England*, are not the same. I need not say any thing, there is an acute pen hath given him so full and solid an answer, that I ver expect to read his Reply.

To what he saith, *pag.* 3. *That the Nonconformists blame the Doctrine of the Church*, viz. *the* 39 *Articles are not so punctual in defining the five points debated at the Synod of* Dort, *&c.* I think I may say, I have been in the company of as many Nonconformists as that Author, but I have not heard them blame the Articles therefore. But this fault I have heard found, and do find, that we are commanded to assent to the 34, 35, *&* 36 Articles with the same faith we do to the fundamental Articles of our Faith and Salvation therein contained.

I thought among the Confessions of Faith, these 39 Articles were looked upon as the Confession of the Faith of the Church of *England*; but I find it otherwise now; for Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his defence of Bishop *Land*, p. 54. being pinched by the Jesuit, (who in this point is not answered) tells us, *The Church of* England *makes no Articles of Faith, but such as have the Testimony of the whole Christian world in all Ages, acknowledged to be such by* Rome *it self. And in other things she requires subscription to them, not as Articles of Faith, but inferiour truths, which she expects a submission to in order to her peace and tranquility.*

Afterwards *p* 82, *&* 104. *He distinguisheth between the internal assent of the mind, and the external act; the Church doth not require the first, but the latter.*

To confirm his saying, he quotes Archbishop *Bramhall*, often expressing the sense of the Church of *England*, as to her 39 Articles, thus: *Neither doth the Church of* England *define any of these questions as necessary to be believed, either* necessitate medii, vel præcepti, *which is much less; but only bindeth her Sons for peace sake not to oppose them.* And in another place more fully, *We do not suffer any man to reject the* 39 *Articles of the Church of* England *at his pleasure, neither do we look on them as essentials of saving Faith, or Legacies of Christ and his Apostles; but in a mean as pious opinions, fitted for the preservation of unity; neither do we oblige any man to believe them, but only not to contradict them.* Thus the Archbishop. And this is not his opinion alone, but generally of the Grandees of *this* Church, as an intelligent and sober Conformist tells me.

When I read these lines first, I read them again, and again, to see if I were not mistaken, they were so strange unto me at the first reading; when I saw I was not mistaken, I turned to the beginning to see who did License it, and was amazed when I saw the name. According to this, *Corinthus*, *Pelagius*, *Arius*, *Socinus*, *Turks*, *Jews*, yea *Vanini*,

may all ſubſcribe the Articles, and be Sons of the Church of *England*, if they can but keep their tongues from *contradicting* them, though they do not believe one of them. Though I am a Nonconformiſt, yet I am ſuch a friend to the Church of *England* as to her Doctrine, that I abhor theſe lines, and charge that Biſhop *Bramhall* with doing wrong to the Church. It ſeems when other Churches abroad read theſe 39 Articles as the Confeſſion of the Faith of the Church of *England*, and ſuppoſe we do believe them to be true, they are groſly miſtaken, it may be we believe not *one*; the Church do not oblige her Sons to it, but only not to contradict them. They are deluded, the Church reproached, and God is mocked.

Several things I could ſay to the diſproving of this ſenſe; but to what worthy Dr. *Stilling fleet* hath ſaid, I ſhould deſire him to name that Book of publick authority to warrant what he ſaith.

1. The Kings Declaration prefixed for the confirmation of them, and with that I queſtion not but the Biſhops did agree *, makes no ſuch diſtinction of ſuperiour and inferiour Truths, but ſpeaking of all the 39 Articles jointly taken together, thus declareth: *The Articles of the Church of* England *do contain the true Doctrine of the Church of* England *agreeable to Gods word*, &c. *requiring all our ſubjects to continue in the Uniform profeſſion thereof.* Again, *requires all Clergy men to ſubmit to every Article in the plain and full meaning thereof; and ſhall not put their own ſenſe and comment to be the meaning of the Article, but ſhall take it in the literal and Grammatical ſenſe.*

* The Declaration expreſſed. With the advice of ſo many of our Biſhops, &c.

Again, doth not the fifth Canon ſay, *Whoſoever ſhall hereafter affirm that any of the 39 Articles are in any part ſuperſtitious or erroneous, or ſuch as he may not with a good conſcience ſubſcribe unto, let him be Excommunicated*, ipſo facto.

Lay theſe both together, and how can we receive his Interpretation.

Beſides, doth the Church not care though her Sons be ſuch groſs Hypocrites? Doth not Reaſon and Religion teach me firſt to try, examine, and to believe the thing to be lawful before I practiſe? *Whatever is not of faith is ſin*, Rom. 14. 23.

I know two Conformiſts, one is known to be a right Son, the other is ſuſpected; neither of theſe do wear the Surplice; the reaſon is the ſame for both, neither Pariſh had provided one; when they came to the Court, the right Son hath nothing ſaid to him, though he did not practiſe; the other was *ſuſpended*. Was it not the *internal aſſent* that the Court regarded? it was that ſaved the true Son.

Are we not commanded unfeignedly to *aſſent* and *conſent* to all things in the Common-Prayer Book, in which are ſeveral Creeds? and you tell

tell us, the Doctrine of your Thirty-nine Articles, contained.

To conclude this Head: of old he was esteemed a true Son of the Church of *England*, who was tite to the 39 Articles, subscribing to them in their Literal and Grammatical sense, as the King required. Now he is reputed *the* true Son of the Church, who doth but submit to these three articles that respect the Ceremonies, Rites, Episcopacy, *&c.* let him for Doctrine be an *Arminian*, *Socinian*, *Papist*, no matter how corrupt.

I would have left Dr. *Goodman*, or whoever it was, that was the Author of the *serious and compassionate Inquiry*, &c. till I had come to his stating of the Questions, but that I find him, *p.* 67, 69. giving one cause, which he imputes to us, worthy the taking notice of; and the speaking to it here, will save me a labour afterwards.

A great part of this Nation, saith he, *having been leavened with* Jewish *superstition*, *or* Jewish *Traditions*, *hath thereby been indisposed to an uniform reception of the reformation of Religion held forth by this Church*; and thus doth charge us with *Judaism*, quoting *Cartwright*, *Ainsworth*, and *H. Broughton*, who were great Students in the *Rabinical writings*, and they leavened us, *p.* 68.

This is very strange, when as if he will please to read over Mr. *Falkner*, he shall see how much he useth these *Rabinical* writings, and *Jewish* customs to confirm the Liturgy, and Forms of Prayer, and the Rites and Ceremonies of this Church. Yea, Christ himself is not spared, but he is made a Conformist to the *Jewish* customs, different from the Law, to prove our conformity. Thus *Scaliger*, and out of him Mr. *Carre*, and Mr. *Falkner*. That I was studying how to give answer to this head of argument in these men; and this it seems is charged upon us.

To clear our selves then from this, and to give answer to the other men, I grant,

1. That the *Jews* had many Rites, Traditions, and Customs of their own; some of which the Holy Page do record. But for their *Oral* Law, Traditions, *&c.* they were not committed to *writing* till the reign of the Emperour *Antoninus*, and not perfected till the year 219 after Christ, saith *Buxtorf. Synag. Jud. p.* 52. some say more. Now how shall we be infallibly certain, that what Traditions they then wrote were exactly the same, which they were in Christ his time, above 200 years before? in such a space of time how easily may things vary?

2. We are infallibly certain that our Lord was an enemy to the Elders Traditions; how then these should be brought in to prove the lawfulness of the things in question, I know not.

How will you infallibly prove the Church of the *Jews* in the purest time, did tye up it self to Forms of Prayer in publick administration? which though it could be proved, will not serve the turn, as we shall see when the question comes to be stated.

3. Suppose Christ used some actions at his Supper like to the *Jews*, must he needs borrow them from the *Jews* to be conformable to them? I hope he did not learn to *bless* and *give thanks* from them.

Homer and *Hesiod*, some say, lived before *Isaiah*, or about his time; *Hesiod* hath expressions very like that of *Isaiah*, in the description of *Tophet*, Isa. 30. 33. as if the Heathen drew with the same pencil, saith *Dongbeie*. But did *Isaiah* borrow from *Hesiod*? the same Author instanceth in many things more, and did the Penmen borrow (or rather the spirit that inspired them) from the Heathen? Because *Plato* hath an expression something like to *Paul*'s distinction of the *outward* and *inward* man, must *Paul* needs borrow it out of *Plato*, as *Norimbergius* would have him?

Analect. Sacr. p. 425.

Thus some have affirmed that *John* took up his Baptism from the *Jews* baptizing of Proselytes, when others have shown that the *Jews* took it from *John*, when Christ put the question, *Mat.* 21. 23, 25. *The Baptism of John, whence was it, from heaven or men?* Why did they not answer from the *Elders Tradition*; it seems it was the *counsel of God*, Luk. 7. 30. whatever these men say: and *Joh.* 1. 33. *He that sent me to Baptize.*

Whence I shall desire that leave to lay by all these Quotations out of *Scaliger*, *Selden*, and other Rabinical men, as signifying nothing to the Questions in hand. We must have Scripture, and Scripture reason, in matters of God.

Here Dr. *Goodman* proves us to be guilty of *Judaism*, telling his Reader, *p.* 69 this is their grand Hypothesis, *That nothing is lawful in the service of God, but what is expressly prescribed in Scripture.* Such an Hypothesis I never saw yet in any of our *Nonconformists* Books. I will yield him more. As,

1. Not only express Scripture; but necessary *consequence* from Scripture; but then it must be *necessary consequence.*

2. Where the Lord hath left us only a *General Rule*, and hath not tyed us up to *Particulars*; let but the Particulars carry in them the nature of the *General Rule*, as the *species* includes the essence of the *Genus*, and we will yield them too.

Yet this Doctor can tell his Reader, that this of *express Scripture is the characteristical Doctrine of that party*; *and that we graft our Christianity upon the stock of Judaism.* Were the *Jews* tyed up to express Scripture in all they did about the Worship of God? I think the

Jews.

Jews had as much liberty *then*, as we have under the Gospel. I shall give but one instance, though I could more.

The Passover was a solemn Ordinance of God; now in *Exod.* 12.8. there is a command given to eat it with *bitter* herbs; we supply the word *herbs*; but the word is only *bitterness*, or *Res amara*. The *Chalde*, *Arabick* and *Samaritan* keep the *Hebrew* word without any addition of *herbs*. Here is only a *General Rule* given, but what those bitter things should be, whether *herbs*, *roots*, *&c.* there is no determination. Hence then, I might go into several houses at that time, where they had prepared in one house such bitter herbs as *Sichory*, *Wild Lettice*, (which they say they used); in another house *Wormwood*, and *Horehound*; in another *Centory*, *Germander*; in another bitter Almonds and *Gentian*, *&c.* so mention twenty more differences, yet if *Bitternesses* were observed, the rule was kept. Again, shall these *bitternesses* be boiled or raw, beaten into a sawce like our Mustard, as *Scaliger* saith the *Charoseth* was? here is nothing determined; be sure there be *bitternesses*, and the general Rule is kept.

Again, here is no mention made of drink; but to have a Lamb and unleavened bread eaten, and bitter things, and not drink, it had been a dry Feast, fit to choak them.

Again, the Lamb must be *roast*; but how, must it be without a Spit, (as we use sometimes) or with a Spit? and if so, whether with a Spit made of Iron *&c.* or Wood, and that of a Pomegranate tree, as a Learned man supposeth, who can tell? there is nothing determined or expressed, and I presume that Learned Author was not there to turn the Spit.

Again, it must be *roast*, but must the fire be made of *wood* or *coal*, or *turff*, or other combustible matter? not a word of any such thing. Thus I might reckon up many more circumstances; that I wonder at this Author, and another of his party answering for their Ceremonies, telling us, *This is the difference between the Law and the Gospel, that under the Law all ceremonies and circumstances, are exactly prescribed, not so under the Gospel.* How true this is, the Reader may judg.

Leaving then this Author a while, let us come to the stating of the Questions; and for the first about *Forms of Prayer*.

Mr. *Carre* begins his Book, and states the Question thus:

1. *Forms of Prayer are lawful*; thus it was stated in the Commencement-house when Dr. *Fern* was Vicechancellor, and moderated. I yield it, being my own practice to compose Forms for my Children, and for others who could not express themselves in fit words in their families before their servants: and what then, what is this to our business?

2. For

2. For the *Ceremonies*.

The Church hath power in circumſtances: and who denies it?

3. For Government; *ſome Epiſcopacy is lawful.*

The Propoſition muſt not be *univerſal*, for then we ſhall fetch in a Univerſal Biſhop, which as yet our opponents do not like. Make it *particular*, for my part I yield it.

I ſhall therefore now give the true ſtate of the Queſtions, and then leave it to the judicious Reader to ſee, whether any one argument the Conformiſts uſe, conclude the Queſtions.

For the *Firſt* about impoſed Forms of Prayer, the queſtion is this:

The Queſtion about Forms of Prayer ſtated.

Queſt. *Whether the Lord Jeſus hath given ſuch power to any ordinary perſons (Civil or Eccleſiaſtical) to compoſe and impoſe their Forms of Prayer upon his Miniſters in the Goſpel-church, whom he hath ſufficiently qualified for his work, unto which he hath called them; ſo that in their miniſtration and worſhipping of God by prayer, his Miniſters muſt be tyed up to thoſe very Forms and Syllables, and not vary from them?*

Let me open the Queſtion.

1*ſt*. That Chriſt is Lord of his Houſe, King of his Church, having the only power over it to inſtitute what he pleaſe, no Chriſtian will deny.

2*ly*. True Miniſters of the Goſpel are *his* Miniſters; they have their talents and abilities from *him*, their call and authority from him; Their Laws and Doctrine what they muſt preach, and how they muſt order all things in the Church, from *him*. They have a promiſe of his Preſence, and unto *him* muſt they give an account of their work.

3*ly*. Theſe Miniſters being *his*, are *ſufficiently qualified*; in one ſenſe it is true, *Tis Iſaacs*, 2 *Cor*. 2. 16. who *is ſufficient*? but yet again *Timothy* is charged that thoſe whom he takes into the Miniſtry be *Iſaacs, ſufficient* men. *Praying and Preaching* are the two great works of a Miniſter, *Act*. 6. 4. to declare the will of God, to the people; and to open and preſent the wants of the people unto God is their buſineſs; and whom Chriſt ſends of his errand, he fits them for both, or never ſends them, *Epheſ*. 4. 8, 11. He prepareth gifts for *his*.

If your Forms of Prayer will make a man *ſufficient*, I know not who ſhall be *inſufficient* if he can but read well.

4*ly*. Theſe are Chriſts Miniſters in the *Goſpel church*. I hope 'tis no ſtrange thing to put a difference between the Miniſters of the Old and New Teſtament, *Gal* 4. 1. 2 *Cor*. 3, *&c*. that the Spirit is given by Chriſts Aſcenſion in a greater meaſure both as to gifts and grace, to

the

the body of the Gospel-Church, than to the old Church, hath been unquestioned Divinity by the Conformists.

5*ly*. For *ordinary* persons to impose, such as cannot, dare not lay claim to an extraordinary Mission as the Prophets and Apostles had. Yet the Apostles never imposed their Prayers on the Churches.

6*ly*. For these to tye up Christs Ministers to words and syllables in Prayer from which they must not vary. This is the practise indeed; but this is the question, by what *right* this is done?

What I have heard in answer to it, is, that the Church allows our own Prayers before and after Sermon.

1. Whether the Church allow it, I cannot tell; the genuine Sons of the Church say *no*, and will use only the Canon-prayer. The Arch-Deacon in his Visitation, did dehort the Ministers from the use of their own prayers, with these words, *Though I do not command, nor enjoin you, yet I advise you to it*; it is more out of fear, it would cause such an *Odium* among the people, should they take them off from their own prayers wholly in places where there is any knowledg; in ignorant places they use none at all but the Common Prayer, as I have certain intelligence of divers places. The Fathers of the Church in their Conference with the other Ministers at the Kings first coming in, thus express themselves: *We heartily desire that according to this Proposal great care may be taken to suppress those private conceptions of prayers before and after Sermons.* As the Judges are the Interpreters of Statute-Laws, so surely the Bishops of the Canons. Now it is clear, they *would* take away all but Book-prayer. The judgment of Bishop *Wren*, and Bishop *Cozens* is well known. Account of the Proceedings, &c. p. 19.

2*ly*. But if superiors being but ordinary persons, have power to impose their Forms at *Baptism*, the *Lords supper*, &c. all but before and after Sermon; is it because their power of imposing is limited by God? where I pray? certainly by what power they take away the use of our own prayers before and after Sacraments, they may before and after Sermons, and that we see they desire it might be done, but that they fear the consequence.

Let us come to their reasons for this: One they draw from the Scriptures, and that is worth twenty others, if they do not fail in the managing of it. Mr. *Carre*, Mr. *Falkner*, and the rest that meddle with Liturgies, instance in the *Form* of *blessing*, the Priests had from God, *Numb*. 6. 23. the many Prayers and Praises in the *Psalms*, in the Old Testament.

To which I answer, 1. I wish these Gentlemen would cast the argument into Form, and see how it will conclude the Question.

The Question speaks of *ordinary persons*; and here is God himself com-

commanding *Aaron*, and giving him a form of words, to which *Aaron* muſt conform or ſin. For others, here were extraordinary perſons inſpired by the Holy Spirit; Theſe are part of the Canon into which our Faith is reſolved, part of Scripture; and ſo *given by the inſpiration of God*, 2 Tim. 3. 16. This argument reaches not the queſtion.

The *Fr. Deb. par.* 2. *pag.* 354. tell us, that *Jehoſhaphat*, *Hezekiah*, *Ezra*, *Daniel*, uſed the words of *Solomon*.

What then? I pray conclude the queſtion. Beſides, as if we denied Miniſters to make uſe of Scripture-expreſſions, into which as I ſaid our Faith is reſolved. We commend ſuch prayers. I have heard a Nonconformiſt pray, and that for a convenient ſpace of time, his prayer was compoſed almoſt all of Scripture-expreſſions, but ſo aptly, that I could but wonder at the gift, and yet I perceived he did not tye himſelf to a Form.

But were thoſe under the Old Teſtament tyed up to words and ſyllables impoſed upon them by ordinary perſons, and might not, or did not uſe their own gifts? prove that, elſe you are beſide the queſtion. Beſides our queſtion ſpeaks of a *Goſpel-church*, which that was not.

But *P.* 2. *p.* 354, 392. the *Fr. Deb.* tell us, *Chriſt uſed the ſame words three times.*

Sir, I pray caſt this argument alſo into form, ſee how it will conclude the queſtion. As if we thought or ever ſaid, that every time a Miniſter pray, he muſt have new expreſſions; or denied that a perſon under a heavy load upon his ſpirit as our bleſſed Lord had then, might not unload his grief to God in the ſame expreſſions.

Arraign. of Conver. Jew. p. 105. Fr. Deb. p. 360.

The Jeſuit *Clare* tell us, that the cuſtom of praying ſo often upon *Beads*, is warranted from this example of Chriſt, uſing the ſame *words* three times; it proves both alike.

The *Fr. Deb.* tell us, p. 360. *A man may be a good Miniſter, and yet want the gift of extemporary conceptions in prayer. In the requiſites for a Biſhop*, 1 Tim. 3. *and* Tit. 1. *this is not required nor expreſſed*, *Epheſ.* 4. 11, 12. and *Rom.* 12. 6, 7.

Anſw. I pray, Sir, how came the word *Extemporary* to be foiſted into the queſtion? Have our *Nonconformiſts* ſo ſtated it? every true Biſhop is able to pray ſo, as to preſent his own and the peoples wants and neceſſities before the Lord; whether he doth it by *extemporary*, or *premeditated* conceptions, is none of our queſtion.

2. No wonder though the Apoſtle did not expreſs it; a man I hope is firſt a *Chriſtian*, before a *Biſhop*; and if but a *Chriſtian*, he can pray, much more if a Biſhop. *Prayer* was one part of the Apoſtles work, *Act.* 6. 4. I queſtion much whether the *Apoſtles* had a ſtinted Liturgy then.

3. Though

3. Though we have but a little learning left, yet we underſtand a *Synecdoche*; the principal work, *Teaching*, is there expreſſed, but other work is comprehended.

This puts me in mind of a Scholar I knew, of good natural parts, but of a profane ſpirit; upon a time he takes along with him another of his Companions to hear him, and gets into a Pulpit to try his faculty. When he had done, he tells his Companion, *I could make a ſhift to preach as well as any of them, but a Devil on't, I cannot Pray.*

4*ly*. When the Apoſtle wrote to *Timothy*, 1 *Epiſt.* 2. 1. *I exhort that ſupplications, prayers, &c. be made for all*; he intended that prayer was a work incumbent on a Biſhop. But here I find Mr. *Falkner*, p. 109. with Dr. *Ham.* making this Text to *warrant the compoſing of Forms of Prayer*. The words ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, *may be taken in that ſenſe* So he.

But 1. *Paul* was as able to compoſe as *Timothy*, why did not he as an Apoſtle ſet him a pattern?

2*ly*. Suppoſe *Timothy* ſhould compoſe, how will he prove that he *impoſed* them on the *Miniſters*, who were able to pray without them? how this would agree with *Paul*'s Doctrine, *Epheſ.* 4. 8, 11. theſe gifts were for *Paſtors* and *Teachers*, as well as *Evangeliſts*.

3*ly*. The *Syriack* Tranſlation will not admit this notion, for that reads the words thus, *That thou offer ſupplication to God*. It being *Timothy*'s, and Miniſters duties, not to *compoſe* prayers, and *impoſe* them on other Miniſters, but to *pray*, *&c.*

4*ly*. I pray what difference between theſe words, ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις, in this Text, and προσευχὴ ἦν ἐκτενὴς γινομένη, *&c.* in *Act.* 12. 5. *Prayer was made without ceaſing*? the Church was inſtant and earneſt in *compoſing Forms of Prayer*; this it ſeems is the ſenſe; what is there more in ποιεῖσθαι, than γινομένη, to force ſuch an Interpretation?

5*ly*. It ſeems then by ποιεῖν ἁμαρτίαν, a phraſe often uſed by the Apoſtle *John*; we muſt underſtand to *compoſe a form of ſin*, and ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην, to compoſe *a form of Righteouſneſs*, 1 Pet. 2. 22. when *Peter* ſaid of Chriſt, *He did no ſin*; ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, we muſt underſtand he did not *make a form* of ſin; implying he might ſin, but did not *make a form*. So *Jam.* 3. 18. τοῖς ποιοῦσιν εἰρήνην, *make peace*, that is, *make a form of peace*. So *Paul*, 2 Corinth. 11. 7. ἢ ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησα, *have I ſinned*? that is, have I made a *form* of ſin? we read have I *committed an offence*?

The next Scripture-argument I ſee they all make uſe of, is *the example of John the Baptiſt, who they ſay gave to his Diſciples a form of prayer.*

Anſ. 1. Suppoſe *John* gave them a *Form*, make the argument into Form, and ſee how it concludes the queſtion.

2. It was neceſſary for *John* to teach them how to pray at ſuch a time, the Meſſiah being about to manifeſt himſelf; ſo that their prayers might be ſuitable to the Diſpenſation they were under. But,

3*ly*. Were *John*'s Diſciples Miniſters of Chriſt called by him to office?

4*ly*. Did *John* tye up his Diſciples to words and ſyllables, when his Diſciples were grown up in their underſtanding, and had gifts of their own? Though I gave my Children Forms of Prayers when they were young, I now expect they ſhould pray without thoſe Forms.

This argument is yet too weak.

The laſt argument I find out of Scripture, is *the Prayer our Lord taught his Diſciples*. All make uſe of this.

A. Let us hear the ſtrength: If Chriſt gave his Diſciples a Form (which is part of the Sacred Canon) and tyed them up to theſe words, *&c.* then *ordinary* perſons may impoſe, *&c.* a very ſtout argument! Chriſts and your authority it ſeems are equal. His is part of the *Canon* into which our *Faith* is reſolved, ſo it ſeems is *yours*. This Chriſt did when his Diſciples were but weak in gifts and grace, for Chriſt had not yet aſcended.

But ſtill two things muſt be proved:

1. That Chriſt gave them this for a Form; *a perfect Form*, as I hear it often expreſſed.

2*ly*. That Chriſt tyed them up to theſe words and ſyllables, as you do to yours.

For the firſt, That it was *perfect* for the end Chriſt gave it, I doubt not; that is, to give us a ſummary of Prayer, *what* we ſhould pray for. I ſhall quote but two or three that you will ſay were no Nonconformiſts. *Maldonate* the Jeſuit, on *Mat.* 6. *Non his neceſſario verbis, ſed hac aut ſimili ſententiâ*; quoting *Auſtin* and *Beda* for his judgment; but proves it beſt from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, that did not uſe thoſe very words in their Prayers. *Grotius* on *Mat.* 6. ὕτως, i.e. *in hunc ſenſum; non enim præcipit Chriſtus verba recitari, ſed materiam precum hinc promere.* And on *Luk.* 11. very fully, *Doce nos compendium rerum orandarum, neque enim eo tempore ſyllabis adſtringebantur.*

Theſe men then judg the *matter*, the *Oranda*, things to be prayed for, to be the intent of Chriſt, but not to tye us up to thoſe ſyllables, as you do to your Forms.

If

If that will not ſerve, then I will urge the very literal ſenſe. *When you pray, ſay.* 'Tis not, *When you pray or ſay* your *Prayers*, then ſay *this*; but *when you pray, ſay.* So that I ſhould uſe no other prayer when I do pray, but this.

If that will not do, yet it binds that *always when you pray*, this you muſt ſay; but when? at the beginning, end, or middle of my own prayer? Here is nothing. And your Conformiſts do not ſay it at the end of their prayers, before and after Sermon too; in that I think you are to blame.

That this Form of Prayer our Lord left us is *perfect*, as to the end he intended by it, I eaſily yield. But if by a *perfect form*, they underſtand ſuch a *form* of Prayer, as contains in it all the parts that are requiſite to Prayer, and therefore called a *perfect form*, as the opinion and practiſe of many would make us believe, I cannot eaſily yield to that.

Prayer is commonly thus deſcribed, and I think very fully and truly: *It is an offering of our deſires to God for things agreeable to his will in the name of Chriſt, with confeſſion of our ſins, and thankful acknowledgment of his mercies.*

Here are four things expreſſed, as requiſite to make up a perfect Form of Prayer: They are *partes Integrantes*, or *Conſtituentes* of this *Totum*.

1. Confeſſion.
2. Petition.
3. Thankſgiving.
4. The offering up of all in the Name of Chriſt.

As for *Petition*, (which to ſpeak *ſtrictly* is prayer in that part we preſent our *deſires*), this is very fully expreſſed in our Lords Prayer, and in this reſpect it may well be called a *perfect Form*. For there is nothing we can rightly deſire, but it is *reducible* to one of theſe ſix Petitions, and contained in them, as *Concluſions* are in their *Principles*.

But let us come to ſome other Parts.

To offer up our Prayers to God in the Name of Chriſt, is an eſſential part of a Chriſtians prayer, *Joh.* 14. 13, 14. and *Joh.* 16. 23, 24. God brought his people to pray towards the Temple, ſo did *Dan.* 6. 10. and *Jon.* 2. 4, *&c.*

But this part is neither expreſſed nor contained in this Form of Prayer. If any Heretick will deny that we are to pray in the Name of Chriſt, convince him out of this Form of Prayer if you can.

For *confession of sin*; I grant it is tacitely implied in that petition for pardon of sin; we do *confess by consequence* we are sinners, and have sinned, in begging pardon.

But confession of sin, and petition for pardon of sin, are two different things, yea differ exceedingly; a man may pray, as most men do, for pardon of sin, from a principle of meer natural self-love; but confession of sin is a thing man cares not for; even good *David* was not very forward to it at one time, *Psal.* 32. 3, 5. much of a gracious spirit may appear in confession of sin. Now one would think that this being one part to make up prayer, it should be as plainly expressed as other parts are, being a principle to which all Confessions different for Aggravations, Circumstances, *&c.* should belong and be reduced, as it is in *Petition*. And as it is in the Commandments, we reduce many sins and duties to these Commandments, but the Command to which they are reduced, is plainly expressed, and not tacitely only implied in another.

So that I conclude with *Grotius* as before: It is a thing often observed, men that in their conversation live in open rebellion against God, while they are about Divine Worship, they carry themselves so profanely, that one would think these persons do not believe there is a God to worship; when they should attend to the Word preached, they are talking, or jeering, or sleeping; at the Ministers prayer, sit on their tails as if no such ordinance in hand; but if the Minister come to the Lords-Prayer, then clap their Hats before their eyes, and mumble over the words; and now I hope they have worshipped God well. But I leave it, let men use it, or not use it, at the end of their prayers, they shall not offend me.

I have done with all the *Scripture-arguments* I meet with in all their Books; the *Fr. Debats* I see in that place where he produceth the *Form of the Lords-Prayer*, tells his Reader, *That the Nonconformists will not give the title of Saint to one of the Apostles, for no other reason that he can conceive, but their good Dames and Masters do not like it, they will not offend their tender ears.*

Fr. 1. pa. 64.

Sir, since you profess your self to be such a master of reason, I pray give a reason why we may not as well say Saint *Abraham*, St. *Samuel*, St. *Daniel*, *&c.* as well as St. *Paul*, St. *John*, St. *George*, or St. *Patrick* forsooth? do the holy Prophets deserve so little in comparison of these two last Saints?

Sir, And I pray give a reason why we may not as well say *Mathew*, *Mark*, *Luke*, *Paul*, *&c.* as well as *Clemens Romanus*, *Polycarpus*, *Ignatius*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Athanasius*, *&c.*? which Authors I

see

ſee ſeldom put the Epithete *Saint* to them. *Ignatius* in one Epiſtle ſix times calls him *Paul* without Saint. Sometimes I have met with *μακάριος*, ſometimes *ἔνδοξος*, but not with *ἅγιος*, ſo commonly; though I do not deny but they may uſe that Epithete too, and I not ſee it. But did theſe Fathers forbear this word *Saint*, ſo as not (at leaſt always) as you do to uſe it, becauſe they would not diſpleaſe their good Dames and Maſters? or was it becauſe the art of *Canonizing* by the Triple-Crown was not then known as it is now? with whom it ſeems, as in other things you are pleaſed to ſymbolize, ſo in this.

The next Head are their *Reaſons* why theſe Forms muſt be impoſed. Now as to all their Humane reaſons in theſe caſes concerning God, I ſhall not much weigh them. For there is no man will ſet up his Inventions in Gods Worſhip without Reaſons; *Jeroboam* will not ſet up the Calves at *Dan* and *Bethel*, but he hath his Reaſons, 1 *King.* 12. 26, 27, 28, *&c.* He is a fool indeed that hath no reaſon to give for his act.

I much applaud one ſentence of the Schools in this caſe, and it had been well if they had kept to it: *Sacra ſcriptura, eſt lex Eccleſiæ, fidei menſura, Regula intellectus, Humanæ ratiocinationis frænum.* I will yet take a view of their Reaſons that are of moment.

One I find in the *Fr. Deb.* Par. 1. pag. 93. *It is ſo lawful to uſe a form of words in prayer, that it is in a ſort neceſſary; we can have no ſecurity that the ſervice of God will be performed well without one. The beſt of men though their hearts be full of good deſires, may from ſome cauſe or other, want ſuch words as are fit to expreſs their meaning; hence may uſe words rude, ſlovenly, obſcure, &c.*

Mr. *Carre* hath one like to it, only he doth not put the word *neceſſary* to it. *Neceſſity* I grant is a ſtrong reaſon.

Anſ. Rude ſlovenly words, are ſuch as I do not remember I have heard; once I heard an expreſſion that was not ſo becoming, and the perſon being told of it, reformed it, and never uſed it more; a better way to deal with perſons, than impoſe and tye up to ſyllables.

2*ly.* Will not this reflect upon Chriſt very much? Either,

1*ſt.* He did not foreknow the infirmities of his people.

2*ly.* Or though he did, yet he knew how to help them, or pardon them, and yet accept of their ſervice.

3*ly.* Or if he did foreknow them, and by a *form of words impoſed*, all theſe infirmities might be prevented, his Worſhip ſecured, and better performed than now it can be *without a form*, then *Chriſt was not faithful in his Houſe as a Son*; that would not provide for a thing *neceſſary* in his Houſe. The limitation *after a ſort neceſſary*, will not ſerve the turn, but it muſt reflect upon his honour. Heb. 3. 6.

Could

Could not he have commanded his Apoſtles to compoſe one Liturgy that ſhould have ſerved all the Churches in the world? So it had been *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptiſm, and one Liturgy*, and then that trite, but pitiful reaſon from *Uniformity* had been anſwered; As if that *unity* Chriſt requires in his people and worſhip, could not be preſerved, without Uniformity in words and ſyllables.

3*ly*. But there are ſome men, even of your Conformiſts a few, whoſe words when they have liberty to uſe their own gift, are ſo apt that the Devil himſelf cannot find a rude or ſlovenly expreſſion, why muſt Forms be impoſed upon ſuch men?

4*ly*. We muſt have a Form before and after Sermon too; for ſomething may fall out which may cauſe rude and ſlovenly words in thoſe prayers, and ſo have nothing but Book-prayer.

5*ly*. We muſt take away all Preaching too, and uſe only Homilies, for fear of rude, ſlovenly words, and unhandſome expreſſions in Sermons; where be ſure they are too common with ſome. (How many Sermons in Conventicles Dr. *Goodman* heard, that he can charge them upon us, as he doth in his odious Compariſons, *p*. 21, 22, *&c*. I know not, I ſuppoſe he never heard one; may be I can tell him of an expreſſion of one of his Biſhops, and that in print too, that was not very handſome for a Sermon.)

But if he denies this, becauſe we may write down our Sermons and read them, as commonly you do; truly that doth not always ſerve neither. But however I reply, ſo may you compoſe your own prayers, and write them down, and read them, as you do your other prayers impoſed, and ſo prevent ſlovenly words.

6*ly*. Suppoſe we meet (as often we do) with caſes, which when we come to ſpread them before God, your Book-prayer hath no words at all. What ſhall we do now? our own words we muſt not uſe, they may be rude and ſlovenly; and for your Forms, there is none ſuit the caſe in words at all? it ſeems we muſt let the caſe alone.

Fr. Deb. p 96, 97. urgeth this argument, *It is as lawful to uſe a Form of Prayer in proſe, as in verſe; but here you do not ſtick at it, when you can ſing* David's *Pſalms tranſlated into* Engliſh *Meter, though the words be mean, uncouth, and the ſenſe often miſtaken.*

Anſ. Where lyes the ſtrength of your argument? if in the *uncouth words*, for this cauſe, and the ſenſe changed, I have not uſed the Pſalms by *Hopkins* and *Sternhold* many years. Others are uſed generally by the *Noncanformiſts*.

2*ly*. Prayer

2*ly*. Prayer or praiſe offered to God in *verſe*, require ſome art to make true Verſe, and fit Rime, ſuitable to *Engliſh* ears; every one who hath the gift of *Prayer*, hath not the gift of *Poetry*.

3*ly*. The people being to join in ſinging, and lift up their voice on high, if they do not know before hand what to ſing, will make mad work; there cannot be *joint ſinging* without a Form, ſo that it is neceſſary. But in prayer their hearts are only to join and give their *Amen*. If the Paſtor be the mouth of the Congregation, and the Service publick, belonging to a publick perſon.

4*ly*. But it ſeems they are *David's Pſalms*, compoſed by a Prophet, part of the *Canon*; and what was done here, was by the Commandment of the Lord, 2 *Chron*. 29. 25, 30. & 35. 15. 2 *Chron*. 8. 14. So that ſtill, Sir, your conſequence is denied, the queſtion not concluded. 2 Sam. 23. 1, 2, 3.

But *pag* 94. *All Churches in the world have had their publick Forms, be tell us.* Fr. Deb.

I pray add, and thoſe *impoſed by ordinary men*, and all the Miniſters tyed up to them, elſe you miſs the queſtion.

I pray, Sir, ſpeak low, the little word *All* makes ſuch a noiſe that it troubles. What, the Apoſtolical Churches too? Will you prove to us invincibly that the *Liturgies* which go under the name of *Peters*, *James*, *Marks*, *Andrews* Liturgies, are genuine, faithfully theirs, and not ſpurious? Learned *Mornaus* * hath ſpoken ſo much to theſe, and ſo convincingly; alſo * *Rivet* quoting *Bellarmine* againſt them, that I wonder any Proteſtant ſhould name them to patronize their Liturgies. * De Euchariſt. cap. 2. * Crit. Sacr. L. 1. cap 3.

If *All* Churches, *&c.* what is the reaſon that Mr. *Falkner* dare not venture above thirteen hundred, and Mr. *Carre*, but twelve hundred years, and leave three hundred years of the beſt times of the Church next to Chriſt, in which they dare not affirm there were any Forms impoſed? Of which a word hereafter.

To conclude this: If ſoundneſs of Doctrine, purity of Worſhip, and a converſation in ſome meaſure becoming the Goſpel, be any true notes of a Church of Chriſt, then there *have* been, and I know *are* ſuch Churches where no Forms of Prayer are compoſed, much leſs impoſed upon the Miniſtry; that it was but a bold aſſertion of him to ſay *All* Churches had them.

I find no more in Mr. *Carre*, nor the *Fr. Debat*. I ſee Mr. *Falkner* hath ſummed up five Reaſons, which have been uſed by others moſt of them.

His

His first, *The security of the Worship of God.* This we had before. His second, *That needful comprehensive petitions for all common and ordinary, spiritual and outward wants,* &c. *with fit Thanksgivings, may not be omitted,* &c.

Ans. Surely, Sir, he is but a mean Minister that cannot do this without a Book; though I know there is a vast difference in gifts, yet there is no true Minister but is able in some good measure to do this; the different Congregations are to be considered; some mens gifts may serve for some places well, that will not for others.

His third, *That the affections and hearts of pious men may be more devout,* &c. *when they may consider before-hand, what particular prayers they are to offer up.*

Ans. Who are further off from these, and care less for them, than your most truly *pious men*, who walk most with God, such as can pour out their souls before God in prayer, (I speak of private men) in another manner than most of your Ministers can do; how have I heard them complain of these as deading their spirits! That truly, Sir, your argument from *pious and religious hearts*, was quite beside the business; they are your *formal* Christians, who sooth up themselves in their outward performances, that are the most devout at these.

But, 2*ly.* since I see you have twice quoted the *Liber Ritualis* in the *Bohemian* Churches on your side, and against us, let me give the Reader an account of it out of *Comenius*, the same Author and Book which you quote.

When a Minister is ordained, the Ritual-book is given to him, (so far you say true; but then he goeth on, which you conceal); *this Ritual-book the common people were not to see; when the Minister died, the Book was returned to the Elders again. Not that the Ministers were bound up to those words and syllables in the Book.* (saith *Comenius*) *but they were less free.* (This is quite against you) He goeth on, *By this means the hearers were made more attentive, and greater admirers of the grace of God. For to rehearse only Forms, or things prescribed, what will there be to excite attention?* Quite cross to you. The reason why they suffer not the people to have these Books, is, that the people might not slight or despise them. *Had the people the Books* (as ours the Common-Prayer Book) *they would more observe whether the Minister read right,* &c. saith *Comenius.* Thus we see when we go from the Scriptures to Humane Reasons, how Reasons clash against one another.

Comen.

Cowen. in Annotat. ad Rat. Ord. & Discipl. Fratr. Bohem. p. 100, & 101. who adds more that makes against you.

Something I may say as to the *Walacrian Classis*, whose judgment* you produce against us, 'tis true what you quote; but withal if you please to read the latter end of the first Paragraph you will find them *rejecting the ceremonies and forms of publick worship in* England, *introduced in these latter times.* And in the second Paragraph, condemning Forms of Prayer and publick worship, though materially well disposed, if imposed as absolutely necessary, and essential parts of Divine Worship, with a certain tyranny and violent command upon the consciences of men.

* Thus in the *Dutch* Churches, *Minister precis, vel distante spiritu, vel certa sibi proposita formula concipit.* Har. Syno. Belg. Cap. 11. Canon 21.

I could also quote *Rivet*, whom you quote on your side for Ceremonies; he mentions your Surplices in *England*, which you retain *ex reliquiis Papismi*; and saith, if you do it in imitation of the *Jews*, or for *some mystical signification* (which you do) then 'tis *not to be born*, saith he; In his pious and learned Homily *de Orig. errorum*, grounded on the 2 *Cor.* 11. 3. he saith, *Mens departing from the simplicity of Christ, is the original of all error.* Christs wisdom is too low for men. There you will find something more. Dr. *Stillingfleet* according with him in this, tells the *Jesuit* piously and truly: *If your Church had kept to the Primitive simplicity and moderation, the occasion of most controversies in the Christian world had been taken away.* I may say the same for *England.* *Apollon.* p. 172. Comment on Exod. 28. Def. of B. *Land*, pag. 102.

I will not deny but you may quote many against us. But, 1. I am of that Faith concerning Churches which the Church of *England* is concerning *General Councils*, Art. 21. *when General Councils are gathered together (for so much as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed by the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred in things pertaining to God, &c.* even good men may err. We know but in part.

2*ly*. We have Churches, if there be any true in the world, that are against these things; so that here is the Testimony of Churches against Churches.

3*ly*. The Holy Scriptures are the Rule of all Churches to which they ought all to conform. Wherefore *Constantine* said right, and as became a Christian, in the Council of *Nice*, *Let us take our resolution of questions out of the Books that are Divinely inspired.* To be sure they do not err.

Mr. *Falkner*'s fourth Reason, *From the difficult parts of Church-offices, of Baptism, and the Lords-Supper, there a Form is needful, &c.*

Ans. He that doth not understand the nature of those Ordinances, and is not able to unfold them to his people, is not fit to be a Minister.

Christ doth not send fools of his Errand; he hath provided for those whom he sends. Now if they do understand them, and be found in the Doctrine of them, (which is best known by Confession of their Faith) they may be able to compose prayers suitable to the Ordinances.

2*ly*. Or if such be composed for your *Tyrones*, when they first come into the work, must they needs be continued when they are grown more able? the ablest and oldest men in *England* must be tyed up to words and syllables, as if they were still Novices.

3*ly*. Truly, Sir, you must not much boast of your Form in this Administration; for the *Parental-Covenant* which is the only foundation of the administration of that Ordinance to Infants, *the God of Abraham and his seed*, this is not at all taken notice of in your Form. Besides many other things which I shall not meddle with now, for I do not aim at your Liturgy more than any other in my discourse.

3. His last reason, *To be an evidence to other Churches, and future times, after what way and manner we worship God, &c.*

Answ. 1. But, Sir, cannot that be done unless we leave them the words and syllables of our prayers, to which we were continually bound up? will not the Confession of our Faith, and a Directory for Worship, (if the Assemblies Directory be not sufficient, I pray let your party mend it) do this sufficiently?

2*ly*. If this reason be forcible, was it not as strong in the Apostolical Churches, and much more than now? Why did they not leave their Liturgies that all Churches after them might know *their way and manner of worshipping God*? all their words in prayer? So name you but one argument that was not of as much validity in the Apostles time as now. *Uniformity, prevention of errors*, of *rude and slovenly words and expressions*, and what else you please. Then do but bring us *forth their Forms* which they imposed upon the Churches, and give us but infallible ground for our faith to believe, that these they were, and no alteration in the least, then Sir, we shall listen to your reasons.

From other men I have heard other arguments: One I heard from a Learned Physician, who had it from Bishop *Sparrow* in a Sermon, and was much taken with the strength of it. *Suppose*, said he, *their own prayers were better than the prayers of the Church, yet obedience is better than sacrifice*. Saul's *obedience had been more acceptable than the fat beasts he spared for sacrifice.*

The strength of this argument let us see: Here is a King commanded to give obedience to *God immediately*, and that absolutely without any question. Our case is, we are called to give obedience to Superiors, but *creatures*, and that in such things which concern God immedi-

mediately; concerning which the Lord hath given us Commandments, to which all Superiours are as ſtrictly bound, as that King was to Gods command. Shall not we then firſt try whether *Creatures commands* do gree with the *Creators commands*? muſt not obedience to the *Potter* take place of obedience to the *potſheard*? if not, then *Ephraim did well when he willingly obeyed the command of Jeroboam*, Hoſ. 5. 11. and *Iſrael* did well, 2 *King.* 17. 8. in obeying the ſtatutes of their Kings. Whence in matters of God we are bound to try all things; though the Commands be not *ſub eadem gradu*, yet if we ſuſpect them to be *ſub eadem genere*, let us have leave to examine. But in ſhort, were it not for God, we could with as much eaſe give obedience to mens commands as you can. But this inſtance is againſt the Biſhop.

2. If there be a *Betterneſs*, and we deny to give it to God, then give us leave to take heed of the curſe, *Mal.* 1. 14.

Another common ſaying is this: *All your conceived prayers are Forms to us*: Ergo, *theſe Forms are lawful.*

Anſ. So is every mans Sermon; a man may make one Sermon, and in that comprehend all that is requiſite to a mans Salvation; but if a man ſhould only read that Sermon every Lords day, you would diſcern a difference between this Form, and the Sermons you hear daily, and think him worthy to be caſt out of his Miniſtry. All mens ſpeeches are but *Forms* in your ſenſe.

2*ly*, Therefore you do but *Ludere Homonymia* in the word *Forms*. In every effect there muſt be a Form, though hard to find out. But Prayers compoſed of Confeſſions, Petitions, *&c.* in ſuch *ſyllables, words, ſentences*, to which men are tyed up in the Worſhip of God, this is the *Form* in queſtion. I grant by theſe, your Prayers differ from others, and ſo you make a formal difference. So we can allow there will be Forms in every mans Prayer.

3*ly*. A man that improveth the gift which Chriſt hath given him, reſting upon the promiſe of the Spirit to help his Infirmities, he doth as he *ought*. Let his Prayers ſeem what they will to you, they are not Forms according to the queſtion, he is not tyed up to ſyllables, but hath his liberty to vary according to the ſubject-matter before him, Occuring Providences, and ſpirits aſſiſtance.

The Scripture grounds which have made me judg this unlawful, are theſe.

1. That Text, *Epheſ.* 4. 8, 11, 12. *Chriſt when he aſcended, gave gifts unto men*, v. 8. and theſe *men* amongſt others are *Paſtors and Teachers*, v. 11. the end of theſe gifts and officers, *For the perfecting of the Saints*, &c. v. 12. True indeed theſe *gifts* differ very much in men. So the 7*th.* v. tells us, *But unto every one of us is given grace, ac-*

cording to the measure of the gift of Christ. But though the measure differ, yet so much is given to every Pastor and Teacher, let him but be faithful in the improvement of it, as shall serve the end Christ intended. Thus *Rom.* 12. 6. *Having gifts,* &c.

I am sure among these gifts the gift of Prayer is one so requisite in a Minister, and so common to all true Christians, yea to Hypocrites. But this practise renders Christs act but various, and crosses him in what he *did,* and *doth* in giving gifts; for though he doth give them, they must not use them, nor improve them; why then did he purchase them, and give them? it seems he gave gifts, to one or two in a Nation (composing of Prayers is not the work of a multitude), to compose Prayers, and these must be imposed on all the Ministers in a Nation, with a stamp of Authority; though Christ hath given gifts to all his Ministers, and many of them as able, and more able than are the Composers and Imposers; but their gift must lye dormant, they are tyed up to words. It was a silly answer he gave, *They may use their gifts at home.* The Text confutes him.

2*ly.* That Command, 2 *Tim.* 2. 2. that *Timothy* look to it, that those whom he admits into the Ministry, be faithful men, *and able to teach others*; is any man so absurd to think that an ability to pray for others is not included; remembring 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. *Act.* 6. 4. and a gift so common to all Christians? But this crosseth the Command; for though they be never so able to pray, they shall not use their gift or ability, but be tyed up to other mens words and syllables. Why not before Sermons, as before Sacraments? give us a Text. But your own party think even *those* prayers are taken away, or wish they were, even before Sermon.

3*ly.* As Christ purchaseth and giveth gifts, and requires gifts, ability in those whom he calls to his work, so no doubt but he will require an account of the use and improvement of those gifts. That Ministerial gifts are comprehended in the Talents given forth, *Mat.* 25. 15. I think no understanding Divine will deny; in the 19 *v.* he *will reckon with them.* What account then shall *we* give for this, when one Talent we neglected, contenting our selves meerly with other mens words?

4*ly.* It renders the promise of the assistance of the Spirit in prayer, *Rom.* 8. 26. but vain in great part. The Spirit in prayer helpeth our Infirmities, not only in the *manner* of our prayer, but even in the *matter* of our prayers; the τί, for so are the words τὸ γὰρ τί προσευξώμεθα καθὸ δεῖ, *Quid oremus,* this infirmity the Spirit helps; but now you will spare the Spirit that trouble, for the τί, the things and words are all set down to a syllable,

Obj.

Obj. The *Fr. Deb.* (falſly ſo called, for neither Author nor Book anſwer the title) *part* 1. *p.* 88. tells us, *The Spirit of God doth not now ſuggeſt to any of us when we pray the very matter and words which we utter.*

Anſ. 1. That the Spirit ſuggeſteth *All* the words and matter, I eaſily deny; but that the Spirit doth help his people in the very matter of their prayers, the rd. I muſt own it, or give the lye to the Text.

2. Let me appeal to the experience of praying Chriſtians, Miniſters and others; when we have been called forth in our Miniſterial work, or at other times to *pray*; that was the work lay before us: when our hearts have been oppreſſed with ſome temptation, our ſpirits quite down, dead, and flat; the thoughts of our duty a terrour to us, becauſe we found no ability to it; we could not tell what to ſay unto the Lord, we wanted words, we wanted hearts, we wanted every thing, but to our work we *muſt* go, we could not avoid it. Well, when we have been entred into our work, have we not found a ſupply afforded, our tongues untyed, our hearts enlarged; words and matter have come flowing in; ſuch ſentences, words and matter as were never in our minds before, yet very apt and pertinent; melting and warming, that the beſt prayers ever we made have been at ſuch times, when we have gone moſt preſſed with the ſenſe of our own inability? though it be not always ſo (the Spirit is a free agent), yet at theſe times, whence could it come but from this good Spirit? Shall he loſe his glory?

3. I thought that praying men uſe before-hand to pray for that good Spirit, for a preſence of *Grace*, (as to the ſpiritual manner of our work) and a preſence of *aſſiſtance* as to the matter of our work, being conſcious to our ſelves of the truth of the ſayings of that great Apoſtle, 2 *Cor.* 3. 5. and 2. 16. how the Spirit inſpired the Prophets, we enquire not; but that he helpeth our Infirmities in our Duties, ſhew me the face of that Miniſter that ſeareth the Lord, who will deny it, and doth not feel the want of him.

Having theſe Scripture-grounds, I go on to Arguments deduced alſo from Scripture.

4. That practiſe which nouriſheth Miniſters in their *laxineſs* and *ſluggiſhneſs*, is certainly an unlawful practiſe.

But this practiſe of Compoſing and Impoſing theſe Forms, *&c.* according to the queſtion, do ſo: *Ergo*, Miniſters duty is, *to ſtir up the gifts of God which are in them*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. but that duty now as to the gift of prayer is layed by.

The *Fr. Debat.* tells us, *That ſome of the Nonconformiſts are for a Liturgy, but they think it not convenient for men of their parts and gifts.* Part 1. pag. 124.

Truly,

Truly, Sir, when our hearts are in any trim becoming the duty of prayer, we find it a very great hindrance to be tyed up to the Forms of other men; we cannot open our hearts, nor spread before the Lord our desires in other mens conceptions; we cannot work with their tools. But when *lasiness*, *despondency*, and *unbelief* prevail, it is as *convenient* as may be for men of our sinful tempers. I could tell you something of the experience of my own carnal heart as to this point; but I find you are a person that jeer at the experiences of Christians, and therefore let it alone.

5. We are to pray for *spiritual gifts*, 1 Cor. 14. 1. I hope not only for *extraordinary gifts*: *Every good and perfect gift*, Jam. 1. 17. tells us whence it comes. Then for a gift of Preaching, and a gift of Prayer. But why should we pray for it, if when the Lord hath given it, we must not use it, but be tyed up to other mens Forms?

6. If you may impose Forms of Prayer, then you may impose Forms of Preaching; so leave us nothing but Forms of Prayer and Homilies to read; as indeed they came in both together. We have Forms of *Preaching* in the Scripture, as you have of Prayer; by what authority you take away one, you may take away the other. Your Humane reasons that I have met with as yet, will as strongly argue for Forms of *Preaching*, as of *Prayer*.

When this argument was urged in the Commencement-house, the *Respondent* yielded it. But Dr. *Fern* being then Moderator, thought this was too gross, and so denied the consequence, *Because in Prayer we speak to God, but in preaching to men.*

But the Doctors answer was invalid; for in prayer we represent, and are the mouth of a people of Infirmities; we are but persons of Infirmities. Here Infirmities are but like us, the Lord expects no other from us, *Rom.* 8. 26. *The Spirit helps our infirmities* in prayer. But in *Preaching* we speak from God, we come in his Authority, and require Faith and Obedience to what we preach, therefore here we had need have a care what we speak; for now we come with, *Thus saith the Lord.*

7. *Diversities* of Gifts and Operations, are the Spirits work and glory, 1 *Cor.* 12. 4. 6. Diversities of *Kinds*, and of *Degrees* in those kinds; this *diversity* is seen in the gift of *Prayer*, as well as in other gifts. As to have in one Lords-day many thousands of Ministers confessing of sins, petitioning for mercies, pardon, purging, healing, praying also for Kings, *&c.* they all aim at the same thing in their Prayers; but the words, sentences, whereby they express the conceptions of their minds, and desires of their hearts, how various are they? the same Spirit that gave this diversity of gifts, assists them

in

in the exercise of them. And it is his glory which is taken away, while these thousands of Ministers are tyed up to the same syllables in their Book.

This *multi-form unity* (if I may so call it, for here are various expressions, different sentences, yet all tend to *one* and the same thing) hath better ground for it in Scripture than *Uniformity* in syllables.

8. What want of *wisdom*, *care*, or *grace*, yea want of all, *this* (with your Ceremonies) charges upon the Apostles, all men may see; you pretend much *wisdom*, and *care* of Gods worship in these things; were the Apostles so defective in wisdom and care, that they could not foresee the usefulness of these things in the Church, and appoint them as well as you. And that, when there were the same reasons that you urge for them *now*, in their time? We are built upon the *foundations of the Prophets and Apostles*; and take them to be as wise as any of their followers.

To conclude, how honourable is this for the Ministry? I will take a boy of eight years old, and teach him to read with a grave tone, a thing easily done, and this boy shall be able to perform all your Ministerial Offices, excepting *Preaching*, which he may easily procure once a month, and he at other times read but Homilies. As did that Priest who was my Predecessor, (only one Minister for a short time between us) that for fifty years could do no other but read his Book, (except one Sermon, and that a strange one.) Yet he a Minister of the Church of *England*, takes the maintenance, and lets the people provide a Preacher at their charge, he contributing something, as that I suppose the Law would force him.

Mr. *Falkner* I see labours much in giving us an account of the practise of the *Jewish* Church, and the Christian Church.

For the *Jewish*-Church, whatever was their practise, it will not reach the question. But however, how will Mr. *Falkner* give us *infallible proof*, that the *Jews* in the purest time of their Church-state, did compose Prayers, and imposed them upon the Priests and Levites, who were able to officiate without them? If he prove not this, (which he is never able to do) all that he hath writ about them, signifies nothing to the proof of the question, and all that labour is but lost.

For the Christian Church:

1. Can Mr. *Falkner* give us an account infallibly of the practises of *all* the Churches after Christ for the first four Centuries? are the Infallible records of them *all* come to our hands? I thought we fell short abundantly of the records of *all* the Churches, there might be many for ought he knows that used no Forms.

2*ly*. It is possible that he may find several Pastors, or Bishops that did compose their own Forms. But,

First, Can he prove they used only those Forms, and did vary at no time? as was the practise of several of our old Divines, that had their Forms of Prayer before Sermon, (but of their own composing) and varied after Sermon according to the subject matter they had been Preaching upon. So did improve that gift they had received from Christ before and after Sermon.

Secondly, He must prove they *Imposed* these Forms of theirs upon other Ministers *able* to officiate without them, and tyed them up to these syllables, else he misses the question, and his labour is but lost there too. Neither of these hath Mr. *Falkner* proved.

The 23 *Canon* of the *third* Council of *Carthage*, which some write was *Anno* 395, others 397, others 399, at which were 44 Bishops, and good *Austin* amongst them, thus ordered:

No man shall use those Forms of Prayer which he hath composed for himself, till he hath communicated them to more able Brethren. A Canon of a Council carries very much conviction with it! what was the practise there abouts, more than any thing Mr. *Falkner* hath produced? By this it appears that the more able Brethren did not *first* Compose the Prayers of those who were less able. 2*ly*. Much less did they *impose* them on those who were *able*, and it may be more able than themselves. Mr. *Carre* wrote more warily than Mr. *Falkner*, who dares not venture beyond twelve hundred years. This Canon interprets *Tertullian*'s meaning to be against Forms, better then Mr. *Falkner*.

How long after this, the question arose about *Ambrose* and *Gregories* Liturgies, and into what a corrupt state the Church was fallen, when Imposition began, Mr. *Falkner* knows well.

For that instance which Mr. *Falkner* brings p. 107. to prove Forms to be in use from *Constantine*'s composing of Forms of Prayer for his Soldiers: Whence he thus argues:

It is not probable that Constantine *the Emperour would have composed Godly Prayers for the use of his Soldiers, if such Forms had not then been used in the Christian Church.*

Let us see the Logick of this, and how it proves the Question.

1. *Constantine* composed Godly prayers for his Soldiers: *Ergo*, Some one Bishop or Bishops, or Ministers composed prayers for *Gospel-Ministers*. How does this follow?

Constantine did well; and it may argue some did use Forms, and who denies it? But doth it follow that *Ministers* did tye up themselves to Forms? I hope Ministers and Soldiers in a proper sense differ.

2. *Constan.*

2. *Constantine* did thus: *Ergo*, we may *impose* our Forms upon able Ministers. How does this follow? nor would *Constantine* impose his Forms upon his Soldiers, able to pray without them: Can Mr. *Falkner* prove it?

Once more. Had there then been Common-prayers composed to which the Church did tye up her self, would they not have composed one or two prayers for times of *War*? they did not deserve the name of Common-prayers, if that was omitted; and if they had done it, *Constantine* we all know bore such respect and honour to the Church, that he would have used those prayers before his own, not lay by them, and compose others. As our King now commandeth the Liturgy of this Church to be used in his Armies at Land and Sea; there being prayers for War, &c. So that to me this instance of Mr. *Falkner* is rather against him.

To put an end to this first question: How lawful a Directory for Worship, and some Forms of Prayer composed for the help of young Ministers at their first coming into the Ministry *, who it may be at first are not so able in all offices to express themselves in prayer, κατὰ τὸ πρέπον, before a multitude of people; how *lawful*, yea how *useful* this may be, I do not deny; but for these Ministers to content themselves with these Forms, and not labour to improve and increase their Talent, I think it is sin against him, who hath *given gifts*, who *requires gifts* of all those whom he sends, and to whom they must give an account how they improved and *stirred up* the gift he bestowed upon them; never did Christ send that man into his work, upon whom he did not bestow a gift of Prayer.

* Thus they who composed the Liturgy for the *French*-Church in *Francfort*, say, *Hæ formulæ serviunt tantum rudioribus, nullius libertati præscribitur.*

How far the Congregational Divines have allowed of Forms of Prayer for some Ministers, may be seen in that acute and learned Divine Mr. *Norton* of *New-England*, to which Book Mr. *John Cotton*, Dr. *Tho. Goodwin*, Mr. *Nye*, and Mr. *Simpson*, have prefixed their Epistles, in a high commendation of the Book.

For other particular Offices, I shall not follow Mr. *Falkner*, for I had no aim at the Common-Prayer-Book more than other Forms; but if the *Imposing* of Forms according to the question, can be proved from Divine Writ, I should yield to several things he labours to justifie; only in Baptism there are four things I should desire satisfaction in, and more must be said then Mr. *Falkner* hath yet spoken.

Respon. ad Apollon. p. 137, &c.

CHAP. II.

Queſt. 2. WE come now to the ſecond Queſtion concerning *Ceremonies*. That the Church hath power in *circumſtances* of Divine Worſhip, I have before eaſily yielded. The *Independents* have declared it, witneſs the aforeſaid Mr. *Norton* in the ſame Book, *p.* 133, who helps us a little to underſtand *circumſtances*. I ſhall only tranſcribe his own words: *Adjuncta cultus, licet non præſcribuntur in particulari, determinantur tamen in generali, multiplici ratione,* (How near we and the *Friendly Debate* ſhall come, we ſhall ſee anon.)

1. *Reſpectu* materiæ: *non ſunt cultus ipſe, ne dum circumſtantiæ a cultu ſeparabiles, ſed inſeparabiles,* ut tempus locus.

2. *Reſpectu* finis: *omnia ad ædificationem fiant,* 1 Cor. 14. 26.

3. *Reſpectu* modi: *omnia decenter & ordine fiant,* 1 Cor. 14. 40.

4. *Ex natura ipſarum rerum, & circumſtantiis occaſionalibus; anne natura quidem ipſa nos docet,* 1 Cor. 11. 14. *Ubi agit Apoſtolus de virorum & fœminarum decenti habitu, in conventibus publicis Eccleſiaſticis.*

Porro determinantur aliquo modo in particulari: nempe ut fiant tali modo, qui circumſtantiis omnibus conſideratis, eſt maxime conveniens ædificationi.

Si nullus ſit error hominis in hac circumſtantiarum determinatione conſtituenda, conſtitutio illa, habenda eſt quaſi ſimpliciter divina. Thus Mr. *Norton.*

By this we may ſee the modeſty of Dr. *Goodman*, that can tell his Reader ſo confidently, that this is our *grand Hypotheſis*, and the *Characteriſtical Doctrine* of the Nonconformiſt party, *That nothing is lawful in the ſervice of God but what is expreſly preſcribed in Scripture.* The contrary to which he might have read in this Author, and in others, I queſtion not.

But whether Ceremonies be but *ſuch* circumſtances, or only circumſtances, is the queſtion. Let me ſtate the queſtion.

The Queſtion concerning Ceremonies ſtated.

Q. *Whether* Man *may inſtitute Doctrinal-ceremonies, (or means for a ſpiritual end) impoſe them upon the Church, annex them to Gods own worſhip, yea ſo, that without the uſe of theſe, God muſt have no publick worſhip performed to him?*

That this is the true ſtate of the Queſtion, obſerve the Preface to the Ceremonies in the Common-Prayer Book, and the practiſes of men.

They

They tell us in the Preface, *The Ceremonies they have retained, are not dark and dumb ceremonies, but are ſo ſet forth, that every man may underſtand what they mean, and to what they ſerve, and ſuch as be apt to ſtir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God, by ſome notable and ſpecial ſignification, whereby he might be edified.*

Hence we may obſerve: 1. *Man owes Duty to God*; this is expreſſed. 2*ly*. Becauſe the wiſe God hath not ordained means enough to put us in mind of this our duty to him by his Command, Threats, Promiſes, and his Ceremonies in both the Sacraments, *men* will inſtitute Ceremonies to ſignifie and repreſent to us this our duty to him; this is plain; for 'tis expreſſed to be the *end* of theſe Ceremonies.

3*ly*. Theſe Ceremonies are ſo clear, point out and ſpeak ſo plainly (*not dark nor dumb*) our duty, that any man may underſtand what duty or grace they ſignifie.

4*ly*. Whereas our minds are dull to our duty, theſe Ceremonies help to ſtir up our dull minds *to our Duty*; and ſo ſtirring up, they help to *edifie* us.

Theſe things are clear in the words of the Preface, no denying them; and in this they ſpeak more, and commend more their Ceremonies, than ever the great God did ſpeak of his.

When I have urged the Conformiſts with theſe words, they would fly off from them; what care they for the *Preface!* But in ſo doing, do they ſhew themſelves *rational men*? does any wiſe man read a Law or Statute of men, and not look into the ſcope of the Law, the Preface to the Statute, ſo underſtand the mind and aim of the Legiſlators? Do they ſhow themſelves ſuch Chriſtians as they ought to be, by ſhutting the window for fear light ſhould ſhine in to hinder them from what they are reſolved to do? Let the Conformiſts conſider it.

To proceed: 2. *That theſe Ceremonies are impoſed upon the Church, and annexed to Gods own worſhip*, is ſo viſible, that there needs no more words about it.

3. *That they are ſo annexed, as without theſe God muſt have no publick worſhip.*

Witneſs, firſt, *Bartholomew*-day, upon which day ſo many hundred Miniſters were turned out from their publick worſhipping of God, becauſe they would not ſubſcribe to them.

2*ly*. Witneſs the Pariſh where I was Miniſter (and divers others) where for ſeveral weeks, yea months, the Church-doors were ſhut up, God had no publick worſhip, becauſe I would not conform to theſe Inventions.

3*ly*. Witneſs a Pariſh in *Suffolk* before the unhappy Wars began, while Biſhop *Wren* there Domineered, becauſe there was no Surplice

in the Church, the Church-doors were ſhut up two Lords-days, no publick worſhip performed to God until they got a Surplice to annex to his Worſhip.

So that the ſtating of the Queſtion cannot be denied. Now let the Reader obſerve that worthy Mr. *Falkner*, and tell me which argument of his from Scripture concludes the queſtion.

If it were no more but the firſt part, I thought it had been only in his power to inſtitute *means to a ſpiritual end, and impoſe them on his Church*, who is able to make a connexion between the *means and the end*. But it ſeems mens Ceremonies are ſo *clear, bright*, and *ſpeak ſo plain* (being not dark nor dumb, as they ſay) that they can teach men, and help them on to their duty, and ſpiritual ends, without the Spirit of God; or elſe the Spirit of God muſt truckle and come down, and make uſe of *their means*, becauſe they have appointed them, which I am ſure he hates.

Do Kings ſtand upon their Prerogatives? ſhall any man dare to ſet his own Image upon Copper to have it paſs for a farthing in a Commonwealth? and yet ſhall *men* be ſo bold to ſet their ſtamp or inſtitution upon a ceremony, as a means to a ſpiritual end, impoſe this upon the Church? What is this but to incroach upon Gods Prerogative? will he not require it?

But ſo *to annex them to Divine worſhip, that God ſhall have no worſhip without them*; I wonder how ſuch thoughts could enter into the hearts of ſuch men as did own the true God, and believed him to be a jealous God, and the Holy Scriptures the Law of that God.

Let me proceed to the further clearing of the Queſtion!

Firſt, Theſe Ceremonies are *humane Inſtitutions*, depending only upon the *will* and *pleaſure* of *man*. So that all *natural* Ceremonies, ſuch as are found among thoſe that have nothing but the light of Nature to inſtruct them, as *lifting up the eyes, or hands: Bowing of the knees in prayer, &c.* found among Heathen: Theſe are excluded this queſtion. For theſe Ceremonies in the queſtion have nothing but ſome particular mens *wills* for their ground.

2ly. Theſe Ceremonies have an *Ordained ſignification*; though the things in themſelves may have ſome aptneſs to ſignifie ſomething, yet they do not *actually* ſignifie, without the Ordination and Inſtitution of *man*.

As in Baptiſm, and the Lords-Supper, though there was ſome aptneſs in the Elements to ſignifie, yet they did not actually ſignifie till the Ordination and Inſtitution of Chriſt.

De Oratione. Such was the *waſhing of the hands*, and *putting off the Cloak* before Prayer in *Tertullian*'s time, which he charges with *ſuperſtition*.

Such

Such was the *girding of their garments about their loins* by the Prieſts in *France* in Divine Worſhip: Concerning which Pope *Caleſtinus* the firſt, wrote an Epiſtle to the Biſhops in *France*, charging the Prieſts with *ſuperſtition*; telling them they might as *well hold a burning light, and a ſtaff in their hands, theſe having their myſteries and ſignification as clear as the other.* For as in the girding of the *loins*, chaſtity; ſo in the ſtaff your *Paſtoral Government*; In the *Light-candles*, the *light of good works ſhining before men* are held forth; yet *Caleſtinus* reproves them, and charges *ſuperſtition* upon them: I am ſure then theſe deſerve the ſame. *Caran.* p. 150.

Things that ſignifie by *civil cuſtom*, as the *vail* did the Womans ſubjection, 1 *Cor.* 11. in thoſe times, have no place in this queſtion; the vail was in uſe many years, even among Heathens, before Chriſt was incarnate.

3*ly.* Theſe Ceremonies are ordained to ſignifie ſome *ſpiritual duty* we owe unto God.

4*ly.* They are means, helps, to our ſpiritual *edification*; being very apt *to ſtir up our minds to our duty.*

5*ly.* Laſtly, they are appropriated to Divine Worſhip: yea ſo, that God ſhall have no worſhip if theſe be not admitted.

Out of this we may make a deſcription of a Ceremony of the Church of *England.*

It is an outward ſign ordained by men in the time of Divine worſhip, to ſignifie ſome ſpecial grace or duty we owe to God; unto the performance of which, and our edification in ſo doing, this outward ſign is a means by its ſpecial ſignification and aptneſs to ſtir up our dull minds.

Before I proceed, I obſerve Mr. *Falkner* brings many quotations out of antiquity, to ſtrengthen his diſcourſe about Ceremonies, and with theſe many are taken; but for my part I weigh them not at all, they ſignifie nothing to me. For the Spirit foretold, *Apoc.* 17. 1. there ſhould be *a great Whore, &c.* That the *Whore* there mentioned, is the Pontifician or Papal power now at *Rome*; or thus, *Rome* Chriſtian, not *Rome* Ethnick, I am ready to prove it, if Mr. *Falkner* deny it. That *Whore* then *muſt* be, elſe the Prophecy muſt be falſe, which cannot be. But had all the Churches of Chriſt, and that of *Rome*, which was once a chaſte Spouſe, kept cloſe to the Rule of the Scriptures in *Worſhip*, *Government*, and *Doctrine*, it had been impoſſible for that *Whore* ever to ſit there. The Whore got not into her Chair *per ſaltum*, but gradually, as the Churches grew more corrupt.

Hence the wiſe God leaves Miniſters to their own wiſdom, and they thought they acted very wiſely, when they added *this and that* in the *worſhip* of God; and formed their *Church-Government* according to the *civil*; and thus acting freely and wiſely as they thought,

they

they brought about by degrees the Decree of God, the *Where* is ſet in her Chair as freely as if God had no Decree about her, nor reveal'd any Propheſie concerning her. So that all Mr. *Falkners* and others quotations, do but ſerve to ſhew us how the Churches acted to bring that *Where* to her Chair, and ſo fulfil the Propheſie; ſuitable to what Biſhop *Downham* ſaid of Traditions. See the Title-page.

But though Mr. *Falkner* give us *theſe* Quotations, is he or any man now able to give us a perfect account of the practiſe of *All* the Churches in thoſe times? ſome, it may be *many*, were far enough from theſe practiſes.

After *Bartholomew*-day our Church-doors being ſhut up for a long time, I went to hear the Prieſt in the next Pariſh. He, I found, was teaching thoſe few that he had preſent (before there uſed to be a great Congregation) and grounding them in *conformity*; and informed them, that as God was pleaſed to inſtitute ſignificant Ceremonies in his Church, ſo the *Church* thought it meet to appoint *her* Ceremonies.

When I heard this, that Text *Zach.* 13. 7. came into my mind, where God ſpeaking of Chriſt, calls that *man* his *Fellow*. Indeed for him who is *God-man*, to be called Gods *Fellow*, we can ſee a reaſon; but how *dirty ſinful men* come to be his Fellows in taking upon them to inſtitute their Ceremonies in his Church, becauſe he had done ſo, I could not underſtand the reaſon of this.

Biſhop *Davenant* on *Col.* 2. 20. ſpeaks notably to this point; it is too long to tranſcribe all: The ſum is this:

If you be free from the Rites that God did preſcribe, then are you free from the Traditions of men: It is a moſt wicked thing they ſhould impoſe this yoke upon you, and you are moſt fooliſh to ſubmit your necks to it. For God would not have aboliſhed the Ceremonial Law inſtituted by himſelf, that a new one may be invented by men.

So he goeth on more fully than I tranſcribe; though ſtill he would have Ceremonies for *Decency and Order*. But this is not the ſtate of the Queſtion, for the *Preface* tells us other things, wherefore theſe Ceremonies are invented and impoſed. Yet that of *Decency* will not ſerve the turn: of which more preſently.

But to return to that Prieſt who was thus inſtructing his people; the truth of what he ſaid, and what is now in practiſe, you may ſee in this Parallel.

1ſt. *God* takes things indifferent in their own nature, and ordains them to ſignifie ſome ſpiritual grace, or duty of man towards God.

This cannot be denied of ſeveral Ceremonies under the Law.

2ly. *God* appropriates theſe to his own Worſhip; the Prieſts muſt put off their garments when the Worſhip is ended.

3ly. *Gods* Ceremonies, though they had ſome aptneſs to ſignifie, yet did not *actually* ſignifie, but by his Inſtitution.

4ly. *Gods* Ceremonies, though in their own nature *Indifferent*, yet being commanded by *God*, are now *neceſſary*.

5ly. *Gods* Ceremonies were ſo inſtituted, that no Prieſt muſt dare to miniſter without them, *Exod.* 28. 43.

6ly. God puniſheth the Prieſts, and that ſeverely, if they obſerve not his Ceremonies, *Exod.* 28. 43.

1ſt. *Man* takes things indifferent in their own nature, and ordains them to ſignifie ſome ſpiritual grace, or duty of man which he ows to God.

2ly, *Man* appropriates his Religious, Doctrinal Ceremonies, to the Worſhip of God, and there only uſed.

3ly. *Mans* Ceremonies, though they had ſome aptneſs to ſignifie, did not actually ſignifie, but by his Inſtitution.

4ly. *Mans* Ceremonies, though in their own nature indifferent, yet being commanded by humane Authority, are now neceſſary. This is their language.

5ly. *Mans* Ceremonies are ſo inſtituted, that no Miniſter ſhall perform the Worſhip of God without them. God ſhall have no Worſhip without mans Ceremonies.

6ly. *Man* puniſheth the Miniſters of the Goſpel ſeverely for not obſerving his Ceremonies; Caſting them out of the Lords work; ſpoiling of their goods; Impriſonments, Excommunications, &c.

Thus *Man* runs even with God; but if Mr. *Carre* gives us the true notation of *Superſtition*, that which is *ſupra-ſtaturam*; if here be not ſuperſtition and very great boldneſs with God, I am much miſtaken.

Mr. *Falkner* once or twice tells us, though he allows ſuch Ceremonies, yet by no means will *allow too many, for then they would be burdenſome.*

But, Sir, if your Ceremonies have ſuch a vertue in them to ſtir up our dull minds to our duty towards God, where there is *one*, I pray

give.

give us *ten*, our hearts are dull enough, and we want helps, if these indeed be helps.

He tells us p 419. *That all Ecclesiastical Constitutions must be in themselves certainly lawful.*

By *lawful* I hope you mean agreeable to the *Law of God*; make but this good, and they shall *certainly* be obeyed. But this is the thing we much desire, which Law of God do these agree with? I see and hear enough of the 1 *Cor.* 14. *ult.* but that this Text will warrant Ceremonies thus instituted by men in the Worship of God, I must see and hear more than ever I saw or heard to this day.

Bellarmine and *Vasquez*, I see, make much use of this Text for all their Popish Trinkets; and *Bellarmine* tells us, that *Holy garments, lighting of Wax-candles*, and their other Ceremonies, may be as well proved from this Text, *as bowing the knee in Prayer*. But the Jesuit wanted a Candle here I am sure.

I have often wondered how men of Learning, that had read over the 11*th* and the 14*th Chap.* of this Epistle, where we may plainly see what the Apostle points at, by his reproving the *undecency* and disorder in their Congregation, should make this Text a ground to set up humane Ceremonies of Doctrinal or Moral signification, in the House and Worship of God.

I shall add but a few words:

1. *Decency* and *Order* are no spiritual graces; for though the holiness and majesty of the Worship of God, is in some measure violated without them; yet they are in themselves but external circumstances, common to Civil actions, Civil Courts and Societies, where undecency and disorder are blamed, and must be avoided, as well as in the Worship of God.

2*ly*. Come to *Decency*, how they serve for *Decency* I know not. I think *light of Scripture*, *light of Nature*, and common approved *Civil custom* should be *rules* for Decency, not mens bare *wills*. For then some men will appoint such Ceremonies of such a colour, and such a Form; and he saith the worship of God cannot be decently performed without them. Another appoints Ceremonies of a contrary colour, and different Form, and saith the Worship cannot be performed decently without them. So many *Heads* and *Wills*, so many Rules for Decency, that we shall never know when the Worship of God is performed decently. For the Woman to be vailed, as the note of her subjection, was the *civil custom* before the Worship of God was known in *Corinth*; for the woman now to lay it by, was *undecent*.

3*ly*. That is *decent*, the contrary to which is *undecent*; but for a Minister to pray without a Surplice is not undecent. You know how many

many foreign Churches will not uſe it; what then? is the Worſhip of God therefore performed undecently in all thoſe Churches? Nay, appeal to your own Sons; the chief Gentleman in my Pariſh, and a Son of your Church told me, *I think you are as decent and more decent in your Gown and Caſſock, than you are in a Surplice.* I have ſpoken with ſeveral Miniſters, Conformiſts, and they all tell me, they would not care if they were all thrown out of the Church; only they are commanded, therefore they uſe them. But were they ſuch things as without which the Worſhip could not be decently performed, they would not ſpeak ſo ſlightly of them, and wiſh them thrown out; they are men of reaſon, fit to judg of *decency*.

4*ly*. Decency is of *neceſſity*, it *muſt* be; the command and reaſon for it are clear; then we muſt have a neceſſity put upon theſe, if Worſhip cannot be decently performed without them.

5*ly*. Decency is as neceſſary in the *Pulpit*, as in the *Desk*; I hope there is the Worſhip of God in Prayer and Preaching as well as in the Desk; but always I ſaw the Surplice put off, when the Miniſter aſcends the Pulpit, unleſs a Sacrament were to be adminiſtred.

6*ly*. Decency is neceſſary in our Family-worſhip, muſt we then have a peculiar garment to put on when we pray in our Families?

7*ly*. They cannot be uſed to *ſignifie* Decency; for the thing ſignified by any outward ſign or ceremony, does not come into my *eye*, but my *underſtanding*; but if Decency lye in the whiteneſs and fineneſs of the Linnen, I ſee it with my eye.

As for *Order*, I know not how theſe help here; what *diſorder* there was in the Church of *Corinth*, Chap. 11. 33, 34. declares; and what *diſorder* among the Prophets is intimated *Chap.* 14. 33. there was very great reaſon for this Rule; but I hope very good Order may be in the Church without a *Surplice*, or *Croſs*, or *Kneeling*.

Mr. *Falkner* tells us, *p.* 401. that the Surplice *properly* ſignifies the *reverence we owe to God*, and the *high eſteem we* have of his Ordinances. This Text then for *Decency* muſt be layed by.

The next Text I find in Mr. *Carre*, is 1 *King.* 8. 64 *Solomon*'s Altar, *For which he had no word.*

A. This is *Bellarmine*'s alſo, who joins *Jacob*'s new Ceremony, *Gen.* 28. 18. but yet ſaith, *Deo quidem impellente, ſed non expreſſe mandante, novam Ceremoniam excogitavit*; that is ſufficient, but for this of *Solomon*, Biſhop *Hall* ſaith it was by *command and inſtinct* from *God*, *Diodati*, that he was *divinely inſpired*.

I would have added more, but Mr. *Falkner* lays this extraordinary caſe by as not cogent, *p.* 309.

Mr. *Carre*'s next, *They had no command for building of Synagogues*

 I an-

I answer, But they had commands for *their holy Convocations on the Sabbath day*, Levit. 23. 3. *Place* must be a necessary circumstance, they must meet some where, *Levit.* 26. 31. God threatens their *Sanctuaries* in the Plural number; some *Hebrews* interpret *Synagogues*. Hence *Psal.* 74. 4, 8. they burnt *All* the Synagogues. The Temple is mentioned distinct, *v.* 7. *Sanctuary*, in the singular number. This before their last Captivity; it may well refer to the *Babylonish*, not to *Antiochus*.

Mr. *Falkner*, p. 311, as I see Mr. *Carre* and Bishop *Morley* in his Letter against Mr. *Baxter*, and all our Conformists, make use of Christs *discumbing* at the Passeover, to shew Christ his conformity to the *Jewish customs*, departing therein from the first Institution. Bishop
pag. 29. *Morl.* words are these: *It is certain that Christ and his Disciples sate at the Passover, and this no doubt was according to the* Jewish *Church at that time; but it is as certain that this was not the manner according to the first institution, which was to eat it standing.* Read *Exod.* 12. 11. thus he proves we ought to *kneel* at the Sacrament, though Christ and his Apostles *sate*.

Answ. Twice we have the word *certain*, and it is certain there is no such word as *standing* in the Text, which I have read several times, as
Harmon. c. 129. he bids us. *Jansenius* saith, they might have their *loins girt*, *feet shod*, *staff in hand*, and yet *sit*, and sitting at that time might be their manner as he thinks from *Gen.* 43. 33. Surely the *Jews* did not tear the meat from the bones like dogs; how then they could hold their staves in their hands, and cut their meat when they were in haste, I cannot well tell

2*ly*. It is very observable that the Jesuits, *Maldon.* and *a Lapide*, and *Gerhard* the *Lutheran*, and the *Calvinists* abroad, are more wary what they write concerning Christ, than are our *English* Conformists; for they all conclude that Christ kept the Passover according to the *Law*, not *Jewish customs*. If *Josiah* gave such charge, 2 *King.* 23. 21. *That the Passover be kept as it was written in the Book of the Covenant*; Shall Christ come short of *Josiah*? Hence the Jesuit *a Lapide* agrees with *Gerhard* and *Calvin*, that Christ eat the Passover *standing*, but his *discumbing* was at the other Supper.

3*ly*. Most of the Learned that I see, as *Jun. Tremel. Rivet*, *Beza*, *Scaliger*, *Paraus*, *Piscator*, *Grotius*, *Ainsworth*, *Diodati*, *&c.* do all agree, that God appointed the gesture of *standing*, only for that first Supper in *Egypt*, as all the other circumstances noted in *Exod.* 12. 11. all setting forth persons in *haste*, but were never used after, when they came to *rest* in *Canaan*. If they did so, I doubt not but it was according to the mind of God; but indeed there is no gesture mentioned

in

in the Law that I read of. Nor ſhall all the Rabinical men in the world make me believe that Chriſt would depart from the Inſtitution of God, to conform to any *Jewiſh* cuſtom; muſt we needs caſt a blot upon Chriſt, to juſtifie our own inventions?

I know no man that maketh ſitting *eſſential* to a Sacrament, as Mr. *Falkner* ſuppoſeth, *p.* 474. and as ſtrange is his next ſuppoſition of a Feaſt without Bread or Wine, (or Ale or Beer with us.) For our parts, 'tis all one to us, *ſit* or *kneel*; but that we find as it was a Supper, ſo it was a *Supper-geſture* Chriſt uſed with his Apoſtles, there is no other geſture recorded; what geſture our Lord uſed when he bleſſed the Elements, I do not inquire; we ſtand or kneel in Prayer; but the Text ſaith, *Mark* 14. 18. *They ſate and eat* at his own Supper, as well as at the Paſſover; for ought I can read the Scripture mentions this geſture *only* at his *eating*. If you can find any Evangeliſt ſpeak otherwiſe, name him. I doubt not, were there any ſuch controverſie or queſtion among the *Mahumetans*, and their *Alcoran* did ſpeak but ſo much for one ſide, as our Bible doth in this, they would give ſo much honour to their *Alcoran* to determine the queſtion on that ſide which it did moſt favour; but it ſeems we cannot give that honour to our Holy Bible, as the *Turk* will to his *Alcoran*.

2*ly*. It is all one to us to *ſit* or *kneel*; one geſture is as eaſie as the other. Till *Tranſubſtantiation* was hatching, *kneeling* was not commonly known in the Church, but for ſome time of the year it was *forbidden*; much leſs was it contended for: and ſuch puniſhments inflicted upon them who refuſe it, as amongſt us. The Popiſh party blame us for *kneeling*, denying their Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*.

3*ly*. That your *Kneelers* worſhip Chriſt in and by the Elements, the great contenders for kneeling have confeſſed, as the Author of the diſpute *againſt Engliſh Popiſh Ceremonies*, have ſhewn out of Dr. *Burgeſs*, Dr. *Morton*, and *Paybody* the Biſhop of *Edenburgh*, Archbiſhop of St. *Andrews*, upon which he undertakes to prove that kneeling in the act of receiving the Lords Supper is *Idolatrous*. Pag. 167.

Mr. *Nichols* urged the ſame, that kneeling in the act of receiving the Lords Supper, being a bodily religious adoration of God before a creature, with reſpect unto it, having no ſpecial allowance from God, was unlawful; when this was urged before Biſhop *Morton*, he found more favour from the *Biſhop* than we can. Treaſure out of Rubbiſh, p. 65. See more there.

4*ly*. Reverence in Gods worſhip we do commend as much as any. I wiſh ſometimes that which men call *Reverence* be not *Idolatry*. But was *David* ſuch an irreverent perſon, when he *ſate* before the Lord in *Prayer*, 2 Sam. 7. 18, 27. all the Verſions hold to the word *ſate*, and that at this time when his heart was enlarged from the ſenſe of Gods

love. Cannot I pray reverently, when I lye upon my bed? and may we not as *reverently* receive the signs of the Lords body and blood, while we *sit* at his Supper? Cannot we know our own hearts? Who more profane in their conversation, and despisers of the commands of Christ, than most of these, who can kneel at Sacraments? Upon the same ground, *i. e. Reverence*, the Church of *Rome* will not put the Bread in the Sacrament into the peoples *hands* (though *Maldonate* grants for a long time the Church did so) but into their *mouths* forsooth, *Multo plus habet reverentia*, Mat. 26. 26.

But it is far from my intention to produce any *new* arguments against these Ceremonies, when there are so many produced by Dr. *Ames*, *Didochovius*, and divers others. It is very observable what Mr. *Jeans*, an acute Schoolman and Conformist in former times, who censured the *Nonconformists* as sharply as any, and wrote against them, while he had read but one side, as he saith, and was a stranger to what the *Nonconformists* could say for themselves, their adversaries representing their objections and answers so weak, and ridiculous) hath left upon record. When the Parliament began, he intended to write a full vindication of the Discipline and Ceremonies of the then Church of *England*, to which end he read all such Books of the *Nonconformists* as he could procure: "Upon the perusal of them, saith he, I soon "found that their adversaries most disingenuously misrepresented all "that they said; that they refused to join issue with them in the state "of the question; that they came not up to an ordinary grapple with "them with their Arguments; and that they seldom regularly repli-"ed unto the solutions which were given to their objections; and this "(saith he) quickly produced an alteration in my judgment, and I be-"lieve it will do so too in all that will make such an impartial search in-"to the matter as I have done.

Schol. & pract. Divin. 2 par. p. 93,94.

This is the ingenuous confession of that learned man, making excuse for what he had written against the *Nonconformists*.

I shall shut up this with the judgment of the learned and pious *Whitaker*, as I see him quoted, by *Maccovius* upon this question.

Q. *Whether when we receive the Lords Supper, should we* kneel, stand *or* sit?

Theol. loc. Q. 43.

A. *Respondet Whitakerus*, saith *Maccovius*, to kneel *doth not only exclude the Rites of the Institution, but doth much violate the second Commandment concerning shunning Idolatry.*

To stand *about the Lords-Table, doth partake of the Rites, and detracts nothing from the Institution.*

But to partake, sitting *is the most convenient, because by this neither are the rites of Institution violated; nor doth it attract danger of superstition,*

ſtition or Idolatry; but this geſture is commended by the example of Chriſt himſelf in the firſt Inſtitution, and of the Apoſtles after the Inſtitution. Thus he; with whom *Maccovius* agrees.

Before I go any further, let me make uſe of one thing I meet with in the *Fr. Debate*, part 2d. *pag.* 397, 399. this Author finding fault with us, becauſe we charge theſe Ceremonies, as *being additions to the word of God*, contrary to the command, *Deut.* 12. 32. (yea, Sir, I own the argument) he anſwers us: *Theſe words*, ſaith he, *from the old ſeparate* Mr. Ainſworth, *you reſtrain to worſhip, when as the Text ſpeaks of the whole Law.* v. 1. *Judicial as well; but the Jews never thought that no particular Law might be made agreeable to the general Law.* And again, *p.* 421. *To ſave Chriſtian Liberty*, (ſaith he) *in matters of worſhip, Gods Law hath only given us general rules, whereby things are to be ordered in the Church; according to which our Governours are to make particular Laws, and we are to obey them.*

I anſwer, as to Mr. *Ainſworth*, whatever were ſome of his private opinions, his learning and piety command reſpect. Whether the *Judicial* Law be there included, I now liſt not to examine. This you have affirmed.

1. There are ſome *general* rules which the Lord hath preſcribed in his word, or *general Laws*.

2*ly*. Our Governours may make *particular* Laws.

3*ly*. But thoſe *particular* Laws muſt be *according* to, and *agreeable with* (both which words you have uſed) the *general* Law of God.

As when men cut little Creeks to bring water to a place, they let in the water in the great River into theſe leſſer Creeks. * Dr. *Templer's* ſimilitude of gold being beaten out, aims at this. *Now let Conformity ſtand or fall, according to this ſaying of our adverſary.* * Pag. 61.

1. Then produce you that *general* Law of God, wherein he giveth liberty in *general* to ordinary Miniſters in his Church, to compoſe and impoſe their Forms of prayer upon all his other Miniſters whom he hath given gifts ſufficient for that office, and tye them up to their Forms and ſyllables in their Adminiſtrations. Upon this *general* Law your Church in *England* have made your *particular* Law, and impoſed your Forms. The *French* Church have made *their particular* Laws, and impoſed their Forms. The *Dutch* theirs; and ſo on. I pray, Sir, keep to the ſtate of the queſtion.

2*ly*. Produce the *general* Law, where God hath given *men* that power to invent, inſtitute, and adjoin Religious myſtical Ceremonies to his worſhip. Upon which *general* Law, *Rome* makes her *particular* Laws, and impoſe hers; the Church of *England* makes her *particular* Laws, and impoſes hers; the *Lutherans* make their particular Laws,

and

and impoſe theirs. (I hear but of few of other Proteſtant Churches that have ſuch Ceremonies, if any at all), and without theſe God ſhall have no worſhip.

3. For the third, I know not whether this Author be of that mind, that God hath left us only a general Law for the Government of the Church, but appointed no particular Form of Government, as the learned Dr. *Stillingfleet* hath aſſerted.

But for the two former we expect this Author to tell us where we ſhall find thoſe two *general* Laws.

That common Evaſion, *Though theſe things be not according to the word, yet they are not contrary to the word*, will not ſerve the turn. Yea this Author quite overthrows that diſtinction.

For he tell us, *Our Governours particular Laws muſt be according to, and agreeable to the general Law of God.*

A Law is a *poſitive* thing, ſo are Governours particular Laws, then ſo muſt the general Law be. To ſay *not contrary to the word*, what Law is this? *Non ens* is no Law. How can theſe particular Laws be ſaid to be *according* to the Law, and *agreeable* with the Law, when no ſuch Law can be found? If the Law can be found, then that diſtinction is but vain.

Though this Author hath ſaid enough, yet becauſe this diſtinction is ſo common in their mouths; I will but add a few Scriptures in which we ſhall find an injunction laid upon us, that in matters concerning God, our duty towards him, we look that all things be *according* to his word.

The firſt Text is, *Col.* 2. 8. *Beware leſt any man ſpoil you through Philoſophy and vain deceit*, according (though we read *after*, that makes no difference, κατὰ with an Accuſative Caſe, *ſecundum*) *to the Traditions of men*; according *to the rudiments of the world, and not according to Chriſt.*

Expoſitors differ about thoſe words, *vain deceit*: I ſhall not trouble my ſelf nor the Reader about them; but by *Traditions of men*, I ſee generally they underſtand thoſe ſuperſtitious cuſtoms which have only mans authority for their inſtitution, ſuch as the Phariſaical Traditions. So *Anſelm*, &c. but *Baldwin*, *Davenant*, *Beza*, *Gomarus*, *Diodati*, apply them to the Popiſh worſhip.

What the *rudiments of the world are*, Gal. 4. 9. explains. This is certain, the troubles the Apoſtles met with in the Churches, aroſe from theſe three heads, *Philoſophy*, *Superſtitious Traditions*, and *Moſes* Law. Now all theſe are oppoſed to Chriſt; if they were *according* to them, and not *according* to Chriſt, then they were contrary to Chriſt.

The ſecond Text, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. *That they teach no other Doctrine*:

upon

upon which words Dr. *Peatly* glosseth thus: *Timothy was to forbid any to preach, not only Doctrine that was contrary, but that which was beside that which the faithful had received from the Apostles.* And are not the things in question *beside* that the faithful received from the Apostles?

The third Text, *Mat.* 28. 20. *Teaching them to observe what I have commanded you.* If he hath *commanded* these things you impose, they shall be observed, but not else. Thus ran the Apostles Commission; but we have found an art to interline the Commission, and *what is not expresly contrary to my command, teach them to observe that also.* This interlining was under a hedg; should an Ambassador thus interline his Commission, it may cost him dear.

The Author of the *Fr. Deb.* here demands of us, *What command we have to take a Text and glost upon it? to pray before and after Sermon? to sing Davids Psalms in English Meeter.*

I see this Author will play at small games rather than stand out; he will join with the *Quakers* for an argument.

1*st.* But, Sir, remember first your own words, a *general* Law will help to serve our turn as to *Prayer.* We have a command for it; the *time* when, left to our prudence. We think when we are to preach the Word, 'tis a fit time now to confess sins, to beg pardon for sin, that they may not stand in the way to hinder Gods blessing; crave for his presence with us, and assistance of us in our Preaching *&c.* so after Sermon to bless him for mercies, and to beg for his watering of the seed sown, *&c.*

For a *Text:* Why did not this Author put the question to Christ, what command he had to take a Text and glost upon upon it, *Luk.* 4. 16, 17, 18, 19. Also why *Ezra*, or the Priests, *Ezr.* 8. 8. take a Text, *give the sense*, and apply it? We have a command to *teach the word*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 2. To teach to observe what *Christ commanded*, *Mat.* 28. 20. Shall we not then take a portion out of that *word*? Shall we not take that command, and open that *word*, first *explain* it to their understandings, then apply it to their wills and affections, as doth the Apostle, *Heb.* 3. his Doctrinal part, in *Chap.* 4. 1. the application of it: how shall we shew our selves *Ministers of the Word*, but this way? shall we take a Text out of our own brains?

For *Psalms:* Why did you not ask me for a command to read the *Psalms* in *English?* The *Romish* Priests will put this question: Is there not a command to sing *Psalms*, *Hymns*, and *spiritual songs?* Col. 3. 16. Were not *Davids* Psalms of old commanded to be sung? 2 *Chron.* 29. 30. & 35. 15. and the authority we may learn, 2 *Sam.* 23. 1, 2, 3. The *Jews* sung then according to the Poetry of the *Hebrew* Language; and

and ſome have obſerved ſeveral verſes in *David's* Pſalms run in Rimes in the *Hebrew*. Our *Engliſh* Songs according to the courſe of our *Engliſh* Poetry run in Meeter, ſo we ſing in ſuch verſes as are ſuitable to our *Engliſh* ears. If you will teach us to ſing a better way, we will follow your way.

De metro Pſalmorum teſtatur Joſephus, L. 2. *Antiq. Jud. cap.* 14. *& l.* 7. *cap.* 12. *and Hieronymus in Prefatione Chronici Euſebii*, ſaith *Sohnius*, Tom. 3. p. 68.

The fourth Text, *Mat.* 15. 9. with *Mark* 7. 7. *In vain do they worſhip, teaching for Doctrines the commandments of men.*

To this Mr. *Falkner* anſwers, p. 361.

1. *This Tradition did not refer to the order of the publick Worſhip of God.*

Anſ. I hope it was never the worſe for that; it is well they let the worſhip of God alone, which you do not.

But ſaith Mr. *Falkner*, *The queſtion between Chriſt and the Phariſees was, whether it was to be admitted as a Doctrine, that eating with unwaſhed hands defileth a man?*

Anſ. So the queſtion between you and us is, Whether this be to be admitted for a Doctrine, *That men may inſtitute Religious, doctrinal, or myſtical Ceremonies, and annex them to the worſhip of God?* You teach this Doctrine firſt as a *general Law*, and then you bring it into practiſe, by inſtituting and commanding *yours* by a particular Law. I know not where you and they differ, only they let Gods worſhip alone, you ſay, and you do not.

His ſecond anſwer is, that *Chriſt obſerved the Prudential Rules.*

Anſw. But, Sir, do you make *Prudential Rules*, and theſe *Religious, myſtical ceremonies*, all one? for what you have ſaid of Chriſt at the Paſſover, I ſhall add a little more to what I have ſaid already; but becauſe Chriſt ſate in the middle of the Doctors, as others ſate, hearing and asking queſtions, *Luk.* 2. 46. hence to argue Chriſts conformity to *Jewiſh* religious myſtical Ceremonies, is very ſtrange, for a man of your worth and learning.

At the end of that Section I ſee you condemn the Popiſh Ceremonies, *Many of them being Sacramental, and deſigned to be operative of grace, and ſpiritual help*

But I pray, Sir, do not you ſay as much of yours, when you tell us that yours *ſignifie ſuch ſpiritual duties, and have ſuch an aptneſs in them to ſtir up our dull minds to our duty, and help to edifie us?*

Treaſure out of Rubbiſh, P 43.

And do not you make them *Sacramental? It is one proper end of Sacraments* (ſaith Mr. *Cotton*) *by ſtriking of the ſenſes, by outward repreſentative Elements, to teach the underſtanding, help the memory, ſtir*

up

up the affections, excite devotion.——And after, *The Scripture expresseth the nature of a Sacrament, rather under the name sign (than seal) which consisteth in the Analogy which is betwixt a sign determined to signifie, and the thing signified.* This is so true, that I have known Christians who not out of a principle of cavilling, but from a desire to help their Faith in the use of the Sacraments, that have questioned whether they were *seals*, and have wished for other arguments than usually we give them, to help them in their doubts, looking on them as not cogent that we give; but for *signs*, they questioned them not. Thus in our Ceremonies, 1. Here are *signs*. 2. Here is a spiritual thing, a duty we owe to God, signified by them. 3. These signs are not dark and dumb, but so set forth that every man may understand what they mean or signifie. 4. They are apt means to stir up our dull minds to what they do signifie, and help to our edification. I think you speak plain enough.

There is as much given to them as was to Gods own Ceremonies, which did signifie spiritual graces and duties they owed to God. Yea something more. All may understand what yours signifie; and they are not dark nor dumb, but fit to stir up dull minds.

That they contain *external worship* also in them, and so are as *Bellarmine* saith of them, (and these you took from the Papists), *Ceremoniæ sunt pars quædam cultus Divini.*

Divine and true worship, I think may be thus described, *It is some act commanded by God, in which we do reverently acknowledg his excellency, immediately serving, and having communion with him therein: whether that act be such as we immediately offer up to him, (as Prayers, Sacrifices, &c.) or such as we offer from God in his name unto his people, as Preaching and Sacraments, &c.)* some give other descriptions, but I think this will hold.

This Worship having the Authority and Command of God to warrant it, is *true Worship.* If it hath not, but only mans invention and authority, it may be called Divine worship in one sense, but it is *Will-worship, Superstition,* and *false.*

In *teaching*, is worship: *In vain do they worship me, teaching, &c. Mat.* 15. 9. It is *me* they pretend to worship, this was in *teaching*; but the worship was vain.

God teacheth us two ways: 1. By his *Word.* 2. By *Signs.* By the last the Pharisees taught spiritual things by their washings; as God taught by his washings in the Law, so do you teach us by your Ceremonies; and it seems very lively. Now all actions whereby spiritual duties are taught in Gods solemn worship, are acts whereby God is worshipped; and such acts are worship; as all acts whereby he is obeyed, are obedience.

Some argue thus: Thoſe external Ceremonies whoſe proper uſe is the honouring of God, are external worſhip; but the Ceremonies in queſtion are ſuch: *Ergo.* Others thus:

All external Ceremonies in their nature formally elicited from Religion, are *external worſhip*; but ſuch are the Ceremonies in queſtion: *Ergo*, they are external worſhip. So that *Bellarmine* ſpake plainly and honeſtly, when he calls them *parts of Divine worſhip*. Hence I ſee not how the diſtinctions Mr. *Falkner* makes about *ſignificative ſigns*, do help at all; but we are ſtill as high as God was, and plainly *add to his word*.

The Text in the Old Teſtament, *Iſa.* 8. 20. *To the Law, and to the Teſtimony, if they ſpeak not according to this word, it is becauſe there is no light in them.* I think no man ſo abſurd to limit it only to that particular caſe in the 19th. *ver.* but this is a ſtanding Rule in all caſes concerning God, and our duty to him. *According to this word*, hence Biſhop *Hall* thus Paraphraſeth, *If any man ſpeaketh either without, or againſt this word, it is becauſe he hath not the true light of grace and underſtanding in him.* Apply this to both the Queſtions, and tell us *according* to which word do they ſpeak.

The laſt Texts, thoſe famous Texts, *Deut.* 12. 32. *Prov.* 30. 6. *& Deut.* 4. 2. *Thou ſhalt not add thereto, nor diminiſh.* Addition ſpeaks defect of *wiſdom* in the Law-giver, that he is not wiſe enough to govern his Creatures, nor how to provide for his own Worſhip, but we muſt ſupply the want of *his* with *our* wiſdom; and intrencheth alſo upon his *Soveraignty*.

To theſe Texts Mr. *Carre*, and Mr. *Falkner*, anſwer different ways: Mr. *Carre*, p. 56. tells us, *This we count ſuperſtition*, ſupra ſtatutum, *to add any thing to Gods Law, or to be too ſtrict in tying our ſelves to more than God requireth of us.* But foreſeeing how this Text will be turned upon the things impoſed, he with the other Conformiſts plow with the Popiſh Heifers, uſing the ſame diſtinctions that *Vaſquez*, *Bellarmine*, *Cor. a Lapide*, uſed to defend their ſopperies.

There is a *preſerving* and *corrupting* addition; a *circumſtantial* and an *eſſential* addition; the two laſt he condemns; *i. e.* the *corrupting* and *eſſential* addition.

To which it is anſwered: 1. To your *preſerving* addition; it is a *corrupting* addition, becauſe it is *addition*. Deny the *Genus*, and you deny the *Species*. Addition is denied. *Particular* Laws exactly anſwering Gods *general* Law, are no additions.

2ly. Find us ſuch a diſtinction of *detraction*, or *diminiſhing*, and ſhow us how there may be a lawful detraction from the word. Addition and diminiſhing are equally forbidden in the Text.

3ly. There

3*ly*. There is no preſerving addition brought into the Worſhip of God, but there is another *wiſdom* and *will* brought in beſides Gods: Mr. *Carre* tells us of additions, *the better to inforce the command, the better to perform the ſervice of God*. We read of a *betterneſs* that doth accede to the Worſhip of God by mens inventions and additions; doth not this reflect upon the Law-giver, that he hath not ſufficiently provided for his own Worſhip? Let but his Worſhip be performed *according* to what is written, and there will be no want found of any thing *beſides* what is written.

4*ly*. No addition could ſo properly be called a *preſerving addition* as that of *Uzzah*'s ſtaying the Ark to preſerve it from falling, 2 Sam. 6. 6, 7. who could uſe this diſtinction better than he? but that would not ſave him. Upon which *Salvian* thus writeth: *Denique Oza ille Levites Dei, quid contra mandatum cæleſte fecit, quod vacillantem Arcam Domini ſuſtinere tentavit? nihil enim hinc erat lege præceptum, & ſtatim dum ſuſtinebat extinctus eſt. Non quia ut videtur ad ſpeciem, contumaci aliquid, aut in officioſa ſaltem mente commiſerit, ſed ipſo officio indefficioſus fuit, qui injuſta præſumpſit.* *Salvian* knew well enough the Law about the carrying the Ark; but in this caſe when the *Ark is in danger of falling*, what Law is there, elſe *Uzzah* would not have touched it? He aims at this to prove *that there is nothing belongs to God ought to be eſteemed light*. Good intentions here will not ſerve. De Gubern Dei. l. 6 p. 203.

5*ly* The *Phariſees* in their *waſhings*, &c. did but ſignifie that holineſs, purity, cleanſing from ſin, which God ſignified in the *waſhings* he commanded. So they did but *inforce* the command, as Mr. *Carre* ſaith.

For his ſecond Diſtinction, *circumſtantial* and *eſſential* addition: *Eſſential* additions by no means he will admit, that is indeed againſt the Text. But,

1. Mr. *Carre* told us before, that *Solomon* built an *Altar* more than ever God appointed. And Mr. *Falkner* will tell us anon, that *David* would build a *Temple* of his own head, and God never appointed it, they had no warrant for theſe, but theſe were *eſſential* parts of the Ceremonial worſhip. By theſe then we may make *eſſential* additions to the Worſhip of God; theſe were the higheſt pieces of the Ceremonial worſhip, for the *Altar* ſanctified the Sacrifice; and for the Temple it is well known.

2*ly*. I cannot ſee how the Church can add any circumſtances of her own creating to the Worſhip of God. If ſhe may make one *new* circumſtance and add to the Worſhip of God, ſhe may make a thouſand, and be changing every week if ſhe will, I know no word to forbid her.

But ſtill I cannot ſee how Ceremonies, ſuch as are in the queſtion, can be but *circumſtances*. For,

1*ſt*. No circumſtance hath a myſtical ſignification of any ſpiritual grace or duty. If it hath a ſpiritual ſignification, it is by ſome ſuperadded Divine Inſtitution; then it ceaſeth to be a circumſtance. *Place* in it ſelf is a circumſtance, but *ſuch a place* as the *Temple*, is more than a circumſtance, it is eſſential to Ceremonial-worſhip by a Divine Inſtitution.

2*ly*. The Ceremonies of the Law which ſignified that purity, holineſs, *&c.* that ought to be in Saints, were not circumſtances; and theſe do the ſame. Theſe Ceremonies impoſed upon us are not circumſtantial, but Doctrinal, and of Moral ſignification.

3*ly*. Circumſtances cannot well be ſaid to be ſubject to circumſtances, where then ſhall we end? but myſtical ceremonies are ſubject to *time, place, order, decency, &c.*

4*ly*. Circumſtances are common to civil actions, as *place, time, order, decency*; but theſe Ceremonies are annexed only to the Worſhip of God.

5*ly*. Circumſtances are *neceſſary, inſeparable* from the Worſhip of God, as *time* and *place*, order and decency ought to be; they are inſeparable, *virtute præcepti*; but theſe are ſeparable, and of no *neceſſity*. *Peter Lumbard* puts no *neceſſity* in the Popiſh Ceremonies, as you may clearly ſee in his inquiring into the nature of Baptiſm, *Lib.* 4. *D.* 3. *c.* 1.

6*ly*. Circumſtances depend not on the bare *will* of man; but theſe Ceremonies depend wholly on *mans will*.

7*ly*. The ordering of circumſtances in particular, is not determinable in the Holy Scripture. I do not ſay what the infinite wiſdom of God could have done; but upon ſuppoſition of the bounds which God did ſet to his written word. Circumſtances are many, and ſo changeable, that to ſet down the ordering of every particular circumſtance that muſt occur in the Church and Worſhip of God to the end of the world, would have hindered our Pocket-Bibles. *Individua ſunt Infinita*. But for ſignificant Ceremonies, all the *Moſaical* Ceremonies were ſet down, to the pins of the Tabernacle; and if God had liked Ceremonies as we do, he could have ſet down twice as many as Popery affords.

8*ly*. Theſe myſtical ceremonies are *external worſhip*, as I ſaid before, but ſo are not *circumſtances*.

Mr. *Falkner* evades theſe Texts in *Deut.* 12, *&c.* telling us, as the Author of the *Fr. Deb.* that the Text concern'd the *Judicial Law* as well. This I have ſpoken to before.

Alſo,

Alſo he tells us, *That divers things referring to the worſhip of God,* pag. 360.
were allowably, under the Jewiſh diſpenſation, ordered as matters of decency and expediency by humane prudence.

But, Sir, this reaches not our Queſtion; we are inquiring for a warrant for ſuch Ceremonies as your Preface, and our Queſtion from thence, treat of; elſe I yielded before, that the *Jews* were not determined in every particular circumſtance. But M. *Falkner* refers us to a former Section, where he had inſtanced in ſuch things. At *p.* 311. I find there he begins,

Firſt, With the *diſcumbing geſture* at the Paſſover, which they changed from *ſtanding*. To this I ſpake before.

2ly. He inſtanceth in the *white garments* that the *Levites* did wear, 1 *Chron.* 15. 27. *For which there was no direction given in the word; yet the Scripture ſpeaks of the allowableneſs of theſe Levitical garments.*

Anſw. 1. But the Queſtion is, Whether theſe Levitical garments were ordained by *men* to ſignifie a *ſpiritual duty* they owed to God, and were to ſtir up their dull minds to their duty, and to *edifie* them? If not, they reach not the Queſtion; but of this not a word in Scripture.

Sanctius (1 Sam. 2.) conceives, and others with him, that theſe were not holy garments which *Samuel* while a *child* did wear, and *David* alſo wore when he danced before the Ark, who was not of the *Prieſts Order*. And certainly they knew the garments of the Levites to be according to the mind of God, elſe they would not have dared to have uſed them, when God had ſo lately made a breach for want of due order; they had ways to know Gods mind that we have not.

2. For the Levites.

1ſt. They were of the ſame Tribe with the Prieſts.

2ly. Their work was about the holy things of God, as was the Prieſts.

3ly. There was nothing determined about the apparel or garments of the Levites by God, *Numb.* 8. neither for *matter*, whether linnen or woollen; nor for the *colour*.

4ly. But yet *black* colour was not, I conceive, allowable about the Temple-worſhip. The *bread of Mourners*, Hoſ. 9. 4. was but unclean; hence the Text, *Deut.* 26. 14. and that of *Aaron*, Levit. 10. 19. when there was ſuch a cauſe of mourning, did not eat. God required *cheerfulneſs* in his worſhip and ſervice, *Deut.* 12. 7. *Whiteneſs* was the colour that betokeneth *cheerfulneſs* in all ſorts of perſons, *Eccleſ.* 9. 8. *Let thy garments be always white.* We find a threatning againſt the *Chemarims*, Zephan. 1. 4. thoſe *black* Prieſts, *Atrati*, becauſe clothed in *black*.

black. So *Schindl. Pagn. Baxterſ. Vatablis, Druſius, Jun. & Tremel.* God had appointed *white* in his Prieſts and Worſhip. Lay all theſe together, and we may ſee good reaſon why the Levites choſe *white* garments; and ſo *David* partly for *lightneſs*, and the *joy*, now dancing befor the Ark. So that this inſtance doth not yet prove the queſtion. Beſides, I do not ſee how the carrying the Ark, or *Davids* dancing were parts of Worſhip.

His *third* inſtance, the *Altar of Witneſs made by the two Tribes.*

But I know not how this reaches the caſe, for that was not intended with any reſpect to *Divine worſhip*; the ten Tribes feared it, and ſent their meſſengers about it; but the *two Tribes* proteſted againſt it, they had no ſuch intent, *Joſh.* 22. 29. *God forbid, &c.* There was *no* worſhip, and our queſtion is about Religious humane Ceremonies, appropriated to Worſhip.

His *fourth* Inſtance, *the Temple it ſelf deſigned by* David, *and approved by God*, 1 King. 8. 17, 18.

Anſ. 1. If this be followed, then you will tell us that ſomething *eſſential* to the Worſhip of God may be invented by *man* (as I touched before) will you, Sir, affirm it? I am ſure the Temple was *eſſential* to their Worſhip.

2. *Place* is but a *circumſtance* of worſhip; if the place were more ſplendid and ſumptuous, it was but a *place* ſtill. But I pray did *David* intend to build a *place* to have that myſtical ſignification that the Temple had? prove this, I pray, elſe you reach not the queſtion; there is nothing of this appearing in the Chapter. *David* was moved from the zeal he bare to the honour of God; the want of this the Lord reproves, *Hag.* 1. 4, 9.

3. *David* did ground his deſign upon *Deut.* 12. 10. *When he giveth you reſt from all your enemies round about*, &c. *then there ſhall be a place which your God ſhall chuſe.* To which Text 2 *Sam.* 7. 1. anſwers, *When the King ſate in his houſe, and the Lord had given him reſt round about from all his enemies, &c.* then *David* is thinking to prepare a *place*; ſo that *David* had ground for his enterprize; only he was miſtaken as to his enemies, for he had much War after this, and that *Solomon* renders as one cauſe why he could not build the Houſe, 1 *King.* 5. 3. And in the 4th v. *But now the Lord my God hath given me reſt on every ſide, ſo that there is neither adverſary nor evil occurrent.* So that *David* and *Solomon* had reſpect to that Law.

4ly. I know no error in it, if I ſhould ſay God alſo inſpired *David.* God had a great councel, a decree of his to reveal to *David*, of building him a Houſe, and of Chriſt to come of him after the fleſh, *Rom.* 1. 3. *Act.* 13. 23. he puts *David* upon it, (having alſo declared his purpoſe before

before in the Law, *Deut.* 12. 10, 11.] and takes occasion from this love of his to God, to open his love and decree towards *David*, that God did inspire him.

Bradwardin doth intimate, *de caus. Dei*, l. 1. c. 25. those words in the fifth vers. *Shalt thou build me*, &c. *Diodati* thinks to be words of admiration, rather than reprehension. And the 7th. v. *Spake I word*, &c. "God had often said in his Law, that he would chuse himself a "place, but had not expressed where or when it should be; and there- "fore lovingly admonisheth *David* to wait for this expression. Thus *Diodati*. But this still intimateth that *David* took the word for his ground. Hence *Psal.* 32. 5. *Until I find a place for the Lord. David* useth the same word which *Moses* doth in *Deut.* 12. 11.

His next Instance is in the Synagogue-worship, in which they were left in some particulars to their own prudential determinations, which the Christian Church is not. Instance is given in their Synagogal Officers, admitted by imposition of hands, when neither their office and authority, nor their admission were determined in the Scripture. For their Ordination by imposition of hands; this he proves out of Mr. *Selden. For their power and office, he proves that Christ owned it*, Mat. 23. 2, 3. *Though the Scripture had determined nothing about it.*

Ans. This, Sir, belongs to another question, *viz.* Whether in the *Jewish* Church (and if *there*, then why not in the *Christian Church*) Christ did approve of any Officers in the Church, that were not of Gods, but Humane appointment, to preach his word Authoritatively? this is a very considerable question, but 'tis not ours at this time; so that this is not *ad idem*.

2*ly*. Yet as to the thing it self: Imposition of hands upon men set apart to office, was no Humane Invention; that, Sir, you know, it was Gods own appointment. But whether all that taught in the Synagogues were first Officers. 2. And *those that had only mans authority for their Institution*: 3. *And those had admission by Imposition of hands*. These are different questions, and here we must have *Scripture-light* to convince us; as for *Mr. Selden*, we regard him not, nor *Scaliger*, whatever he saith of our *ignorance*, which Quotation of yours out of him, I observed well [illegible] I read him. We are upon things that concern God; Humane Quotations, and so whatever you bring from Fathers and others, I look on them as a Cypher; as the Cypher may stand, it signifies much, and as it may stand, it signifies nothing. First give me a Scripture, then give me Humane testimony suitable to it, and it signifies much. Yea, if there be a Scripture not so clear and plain as some

are;

are, yet may fairly carry such a sense, and there be not another Scripture that doth plainly oppose that sense, here the practise of the Churches next to the Apostles, and so long since, shall carry me into that sense. Which I desire the Reader to consider and judg of my opinion, because I shall make use of it afterwards; but all mens opinions, and Churches practises, without a Scripture, are but a Cypher before or without a figure to me, they signifie nothing. I know very well that *Jews* and Gentiles too have a nature that is cross to God in every Commandment; our enmity will not let any command escape, but even in his Instituted Worship where there is the least temptation, there it will shew it self, 'tis not handsome enough as God appoints it, unless we like Apes may dress it. If *Selden* and *Scaliger* could have given us the practises of such a Church where this root of enmity was not, then I should have listned to them very much.

But to the Argument;

1. That all those who did teach in the Synagogues were *Officers* thus constituted, as Mr. *Selden* tells us, I suppose Mr. *Falkner* will not affirm it; the example of our Lord, *Luk.* 4. 16, 17, *&c.* so of *Paul*, *Act.* 13. 15, 16. shews the contrary. *Grotius* we can believe, for he speaks with the Scripture: saith he, *Notandum in Synagogis Judaicis unicuique exercitato in sacris literis (erant autem fermè omnes, exceptis τοῖς ἀκούουσι, qui mos hodie apud nos viget) concessum fuisse sacras Literas Interpretari.* Afterwards he gives us the difference between the Interpreters of the *Law* in the Synagogue, and of the *Gospel* in the Church: *In synagoga docebant quotquot ἄκουσι, habebant ἀκουσθέντες, in Ecclesia, probati quique, & honorem testimonio adepti ut Tertullianus loquitur*, i.e. *χειροτονηθέντες.* So that according to him they were not Ordained. The reason of the difference he also giveth thus: *Not only because the Preaching of the Gospel is of more moment than the expounding of the Law, but because in the Christian Church the Preachers of the word are likewise dispensers of the Sacraments, but the Masters of the Synagogues administred no Sacraments, no not Circumcision.* This is cross to *Selden*. I shall yield to *Grotius*, having Scripture on his side, the other not. All that teach in the Christian Church are Ordained; not so in the Synagogue.

De Impor. p. 374

Pag. 375.

Weems, exp. Cer. Law, 122.

2*ly.* As to the *Pharisees:* all the *Pharisees* were not *Teaching-Pharisees*; not *Perushim*, but *Parushim*. Some were but *Trick-Pharisees*, as we may call them, saith *Weems*. Now since all of them were not *Teachers*, and it is agreed by the Learned that many of the Priests and Levites were Pharisees; and *Gerhard* proves from several verses here, that these were such, no private persons, but persons in Office; and *he* with *Beza* and *Hammond* ground this Text and Command of Christ upon *Numb.* 11. 16. they had *Divine Institution.*

3*ly.* Nor

3ly. Nor will we refuse to hear those who preach the Gospel soundly (as if they expounded the Law truly, Christ would have them heard) though we judg their Ordination mixed with corruption, or doubt whether they be rightly called; their Ordination being questioned, either because some are Ordained by such, who as *such* are no Officers of Christ; and others without *Imposition of hands*.

4ly. Dr. *Lightfoot* understands this Chair *de Cathedra Legislativa*, and tells us that Christ here asserts the Authority of the *Magistrates*, and exhorts to the obedience of them in lawful things. And *Grotius* seems to incline this way; and if so, this is not to the purpose.

His second Instance is, *the habit of the Prophets; a rough or hairy garment.*

Ans. But was this annexed and appropriated to Divine Worship? or was it that garment they wore daily, where ever they went? so a Minister in his Gown and Cassock, if you will make a civil distinction, I like it very well; but this touches not the question; for the Garments in the Synagogal Assemblies, out of *Sustenion*, we little regard them, if they were used for a Religious mystical signification (which doth not appear, and so reaches not the question); if so, you may tell us of the *Fact*, but our question is, *de Jure*.

His third Instance is, from the *decent gestures commanded and used in* Nehem. 8. *& ch.* 9. *Standing up, &c.*

Ans. We like *decent gestures* very well; and if that were all, we will stand up at the reading of the *Law*, of the *Gospels* and *Epistles* too; we shall make no difference, being all Divinely inspired. Yea, if that will content you, and our health will bear it, we will set uncovered too during the time of holy Worship; which in these times is so much in practise, and expected, over it was in Queen *Elizabeth*'s time, though I do not like the ground of their uncovering; but the 52 *Injunction* shews it was their allowance and custom in Sermon-time to sit covered; else why do the Injunction require that at the naming of Jesus, *men should uncover their heads*? If they sate always uncovered, how could they answer this?

His last Instance, *is their adding of Baptism, or washing, to Circumcision, initiating their Proselytes.*

Ans. I have read indeed of such a practise taken up in the latter time of the *Jews*, in imitation of *Johns Baptism*; but still, Sir, we want one thing, *and this God approved of*; how prove you that? *quo jure?* by what Divine warrant was it done? If you intended to shew us your reading, that is one thing; but if you intended to convince us, you know this is not the way; for you do but prove the *Jews* had as carnal hearts as we, unless you can shew us that what they did in Di-

vine Worſhip was agreeable to that Rule, which is the Law to them, and to us, by which we muſt all be judged.

Next, Mr. *Falkner* comes to *Natural Worſhip*, and ſhows their cuſtoms about an *Oath*, which I ſhall take into conſideration when I anſwer the *Fr. Debate*, where I find an argument againſt us from hence.

His next, the *Rites* (as he calls them) of *Memorial*, Stones ſet up by *Samuel*, *Jacob*, *Joſhua*.

Anſ. But how do theſe reach the queſtion? If they at *London* will erect a Monument that Poſterity may know where that ſore *Judgment* of God (as *Samuels* was *Mercy*) in the deflagration of the City began. If *Laban* and *Jacob* will make a heap of ſtones in the place where they ſware, though it may be neither *Laban* or *Jacob* ever came to the place again to ſee theſe ſtones, what are theſe to our queſtion? ſo that of *Joſhua*; what ſignification of an Oath is there in a ſtone lying on the ground? they may remember, that in this place *Joſhua* made us ſwear. The ſtone ſerves for a *Witneſs* that there was ſuch a part of Worſhip there celebrated. If *Joſhua* had called *men* of other Nations to hear the Covenant, and witneſs what they ſware, what would you make of theſe witneſſes to force the queſtion in hand?

The Stone was a witneſs on both ſides, *Joſh.* 24. 27. for it *hath heard all the words of the Lord which he ſpake unto us*; as well as of *their engagement to God*. The Stone did not *ſignifie* the Oath.

His next Inſtance is *in the uſe of ſackcloth and aſhes, &c.*

Anſ. But were theſe invented among the *Jews*, and uſed by them only in a Religious way, or were they common to others, Heathens as well as *Jews*, to ſhow by a civil cuſtom their *ſubmiſſions*, *fear*, *ſorrow* they were under, lying low before their ſuperiors; or noting an afflicted ſtate? The ſervants of *Benhadad* come to *Ahab* with *ſackcloth on their loins*, 1 King. 20. 31, 32. theſe were no *Jews*. The King of *Nineveh*, Jon. 3. 8. cauſe *men* and *beaſts* (more than we read of among the *Jews* that I remember) to be clothed with Sackcloth. God threatens *Moab* with Sackcloth, *Jer.* 48. 37. The Prophet *Joel* in the name of God, *Joel* 1. 13. calls to the Prieſts to lye in Sackcloth. Do but you ſhow us as much for the queſtions in hand, and we ſhall be ſatisfied.

When *Tamar*, 2 Sam. 13. 19. *put aſhes on her head*, was it upon a Religious account? Who taught the Heathen King of *Nineveh* to ſit in ſackcloth and aſhes? *Jon.* 3. 6. did the Church of the *Jews*, and he obeyed them? Still theſe conclude not the queſtion.

As for the *indifference* of the things which Mr. *Falkner* next mentions, I ſhall leave that, till I have conſidered his other Scripture-arguments, for that I only regard.

He passeth on to the New Testament, where I see Mr. *Carve*, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, Mr. *Falkner*, and all of them agree in urging the *Holy kiss*, the *Love-feasts*; and Dr. *Stillingfleet* adds the *Deaconesses*, which are alterable Rites, though Apostolical, and layed by, even by the Nonconformists.

But this still will not prove the question, unless you will do it thus: If we may *detract* from the word, then we may add to the word (both are forbidden) but you detract from the word. As indeed this is *Omission*, the other is positive.

But I pray, Sir, do not you argue from *our sin* (if we be guilty) to justifie *yours*. For if they be indeed of *Apostolical Institution*, we will take them all up again.

For the *Love-feasts*, that they were of Apostolical Institution, especially as joined to the Lords-Supper, I find nothing to perswade me to it. *Feasting* was a civil custom for the maintaining of love, long before any of the Apostles were born. The Apostle finds them in use, but 1 *Cor.* 11. 22, 34. he finds fault with them, and takes them away from the Lords Supper. *Calvin* and *Beza* both affirm the same. If some Churches did retain them, yet not all. *Just. Mart. Apol.* 2. giving us an account how they performed the worship of God on the Lords-day, makes no mention of this, though he doth of the Lords-Supper. And for Feasting after *Tertullian*'s fashion, if we administer at noon time; the poor Nonconformists use to have the poor of the Church to dine with them. So that this reaches not me.

So for *Kissing*, *men kissing men, and women kissing women*, which you say was meant by their kissing, *not men kissing women*. This also was a civil custom a thousand of years before any Apostle was born; how then this should be called an *Apostolical Constitution* I cannot understand. Our civil custom is to give the right-hand, or the hand, and signifies the same that kissing doth; the Apostle *modifies* a civil custom of their own; and we stand obliged to the same duty the Apostle intends in it, *even Love without Dissimulation*.

For the *Deaconess*, if it were indeed an office required in all Churches, I think we have done ill to omit it. If the Council of *Laodicea*, Can. 11. did remove the Deaconesses, as some think, we regard no such Councils. The Churches of *Bohemia* did keep up that Office, as *Comenius* relates.

That it was an *office*, properly so called, I question; The *Deaconess* was not *ordained*, as were all Church-officers, and that with Imposition of hands; they who omit Imposition of hands, let them answer it. *Danaus* saith, *Non tam fuit munus hoc publicum quam subsidium aliquod a Diaconis quæsitum*, she was a help to the Deacon in such

thing as were not comely for a Deacon to meddle in, if the Sisters of the Church were sick. As to this point, in Churches rightly constituted, the Deacon takes so much care of the sick, though poor, that as to the Nurse, Food and Physick, there is no want, this I know by good experience. 2ly. *Danæus* thinks they were helpful at their Love-feasts to wash, dress, &c. this end is easily answered, they being removed. The third was in the entertainment of strangers, washing of feet, as in those Countries was their custom; but in our Countries, where there is no such custom, wearing shoos as we do, and not so hot a Climate, and here all are Christians *nomine tenus*, that end and use is laid by. The first use then only remains, which is answered as I said before.

Dr. *Stilling fleet*, he tells us *dipping* in Baptism is out of practise.

Anſ. It is but very lately then; a Gentleman told me he well remembred the dipping of Infants; the *Common-Prayer*-Book doth not lay it by, but that leaves you to use it, or sprinkling. I thought *Baptizing* had been the command. Can there be no Baptizing but by dipping? will he affirm it, that the Baptizing of the three thousand in *Act.* 2. and the Jaylor and his Family, *Act.* 16. was by *dipping*? It is all one to me whether by dipping or *pouring of water*, Ezek. 36.25. What Mr. *Falkner* would gather from the *praying and prophesying uncovered*, 1 Cor. 11. 4. I know not, it is our practise he knows, though I have seen a *French* Minister Preaching with his Hat on; would he have it that *Paul* from a *private spirit*, did give this Rule contrary to the practise of other Churches who had used to pray and preach covered? For *Order* and *Decency*, which Mr. *Falkner* mentions, I never opposed it; nor doth this concern our question.

For the Decree mentioned in *Act.* 15 which Mr. *Falkner* produceth, if that had been well observed, much of our trouble might have been spared. The Apostles and Elders, with the direction of the Holy Ghost, imposed only things *necessary*; that *necessity* was antecedaneous to the Decree, either *necessary* in themselves, as *abstaining from fornication*, &c. or necessary by a *positive* Law of God long in force, and which the weak believers could not understand to be repealed, nor did most I believe of them so see it, till the *Temple* it self, the Head of all was destroyed. The Apostle *James* at *vers.* 21. gives the reason, *Moses* (saith he) *is read in the Synagogues every Sabbath-day*; to hear *Blood* so often forbidden in *Moses* (yea this near to the seventh Command given to the Sons of *Noah*, Gen. 9. 4. which Laws if a Heathen did not observe he was not permitted to live among the *Israelites*) and now to see the believing Gentiles *eating of blood*, &c. what a horrible offence had this been, and hinderance to the Gospel? Hence the things were

first

firſt neceſſary, *Ergo*, the Decree; but not neceſſary only becauſe of the Decree. Bleſſed *Auſtin* ſpeaks very well to theſe Ceremonies, *Epiſt.* 19.

This is a good Rule for Impoſers, *Primum in uno quoque genere eſt menſura reliquorum*, Impoſe only *neceſſary* things.

For thoſe who refuſe to eat blood at this day from that Decree, I think they err very much. Let them obſerve *Levit.* 17. 11. the reaſon of the Command; and tell me whether they deny the blood which maketh atonement for our ſouls to be ſhed.

That Decree then commanded no poſitive duty, as our queſtions do, but a forbearance of ſome things in point of ſcandal, which God had forbidden.

The laſt Scripture I ſee Mr. *Falkner* mentions, *in Chriſt his waſhing of* Peters *feet, a* Jewiſh *Paſchal Rite.*

Anſw. As to the *waſhing*, being a thing in civil uſe in thoſe Countries, and not in ours, if the thing Chriſt intended in it to which we are ſtrictly bound, will not ſerve, though we uſe not to waſh feet according to the mode of thoſe Countries, we will take up that alſo, rather than omit any of his Inſtitutions.

But that Chriſt uſed it as a *Jewiſh Paſchal Rite*, that is another queſtion, and brings me on to the conſideration of an argument Mr. *Carre* and others out of *Scaliger* make uſe of to prove Chriſt his Conformity to *Jewiſh* Ceremonies, *as Chriſt his dipping the ſop in the Charoſeth, a ſawce they made. His waſhings*, &c.

Anſ. Here would fall in ſeveral things to conſider, but I muſt not meddle with them.

As to this Sop, *Grotius* and *Maldonate* deny that Chriſt dipped the Sop in the Charoſeth, but in ſome other ſawce at their common Supper. Yet I queſtion whether they had any other Supper beſide the Paſchal Lamb; a whole Lamb would ſerve thirteen of us to ſup well, though our Climate be colder; I ſee *Piſcator* and *Beza* incline to my thoughts.

2*ly.* But if the ſawce *Charoſeth* were made of *Cichory*, *Lettice*, and other bitter herbs, as *Scaliger* ſaith, *& aliis neſcio quibus*, and with him agree *Capellus*, then Chriſt kept to the Inſtitution; for the Law was only general, for *Bitterneſſes*; but neither is this ſawce yet proved at Chriſts Table.

3*ly.* For *waſhings*, there were *Civil*, *Religious*, and *ſuperſtitious* waſhings; let *Scaliger* prove that Chriſt conformed to the Superſtitious waſhings: *They did bleſs God for the waſhing of hands, and then waſhed their hands.* We know how conformable Chriſt was to them in waſhing of hands, but this is waſhing of feet: *More prorſus inſolito*, ſaith

ſaith *Gerhard*. Great debate there is among Divines when this waſhing was, whether *before*, *after*, or *in* Supper time. *Druſius* finds ſuch a knot here, that he that can untye it, ſhall be to him *Magnus in Oculis*.

4*ly*. This waſhing of *Peter* is recorded in *Joh*. 13. 5. at that Supper; now what if that Supper were not the Paſchal Supper? then all that *Scaliger* and Mr. *Car* with others have built upon it, falls to the ground.

I had my eye upon thoſe words in the firſt verſe, πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα, *before the feaſt of the Paſſover*; which made me think the Supper mentioned in the 2. *v*. could not be the Paſſover; there being nothing in thoſe words from the firſt verſe to the ſecond verſe to force a mans reaſon to conceive that thoſe words, *Supper being ended*, in the ſecond verſe, to be meant of the Paſchal Supper; but I was fearful to declare my thoughts, till reading Dr. *Lightfoot* I found him fully of my mind, denying any *Charoſeth* at this Supper, *&c*.

Gleanings out of Exodus 1. S. 19.

Having ſuch a man on my ſide, I will prove his and my opinion as well as I can.

Our Bibles in the Margent refer us to *Mat*. 26. 2. now to know what time that was *John* means, when he ſaith, *before the Paſſover*, *Joh*. 13. 1. *Matthew* tells us, *it was two days before the Feaſt of the Paſſover*. So doth *Mark* 14. *ch*. 1. but where is Chriſt at this time two days before the Paſſover? *Mark* tells us, *Ch*. 14. 3. at *Bethany*; neither *Matthew* nor *Mark* tell us whether it were Dinner or Supper, but that he *ſate at meat*; but *John* tells us, *Supper being ended*.

2. While Chriſt is at *Bethany*, the chief Prieſt and Scribes were conſulting how to take him, *Mark* 14. 1, 2, 3. & *Mat*. 26. 2, 3, 4, *&c*. now from this Supper goeth *Judas* unto them, who were now conſulting to bargain, *Mat*. 26. 14, 15.

3. I doubt not but there was ſome ſpace of time between *Judas* bargain made with the Prieſts, and his delivering Chriſt up to them the Text is plain, *Mat*. 26. 16. *And from that time he ſought opportunity to betray him*. So that he had not opportunity ſo ſoon as he had ſold him, *Luk*. 22. 6. *He ſought opportunity to betray him*. But when then did he make his bargain? *when Satan was entred into him*, Luk. 22. 3, 4, 5. when did Satan enter into him? *After the ſop Satan entred into him*, Joh. 13. 27. What Supper then was this at which *Judas* received the ſop? not the Paſſover; for the Prieſts conſulted how to take him two days before the Paſſover, while Chriſt is at *Bethany*; but the *opportunity* which he had been ſeeking to make good his bargain, he found it ſo ſoon as Chriſt had eaten the Paſſover, inſtituted his own Supper, and was gone forth; then that could not be the time he made his bargain; ſo the ſop could not be at the Paſſover, for then you will make the time of his *bargain* and *delivery* to be almoſt the ſame, contrary to both the Texts.

4. When

4. When Christ bad *Judas*, *Joh.* 13.27. *That thou doest, do quickly*; the Disciples thought the meaning was that *Judas* having the Bag, he bad him *buy those things we have need of against the Feast*, vers. 28, 29. What *Feast* was that? the Passover no question; so saith *a Lapide*, *Ad emendum necessaria pro instante Pascate.* But if this were the Paschal Supper at which *Judas* received the sop, then what need to buy against the Feast, when the Feast was past, and Christ knew he was now to die?

I see but two things that trouble me, but the same doubts are moved by *Gerhard*, *Maldonate*, and *a Lapide*, who interpret this Supper of the Passover as others commonly do. To which doubts they have given answers, and their answers will serve me better, than if I should interpret it as they do of the Paschal Supper. As yet then Christ is no Conformist.

Having done with these men, now to our good friend the Author of the *Friendly Debate*, in whom I find something more, p. 102. he tells us, *We use Ceremonies in Divine Worship, as in an Oath, laying the hand upon the Book, kissing the Testament, which are outward signs accompanying swearing, though they belong not to the essence of it.*

A. 1. I have heard of some, and may be there are more than we are aware of, who will lay their hand on the Book, kiss it, and do it readily, because they think they do not swear, and so regard not what you say to them; but if you put them to *lift up their hand*, as we read in Scripture they did who sware, they would not do that, because then they thought they should swear indeed; though I do not justifie these persons in this, yet if an Oath be of consequence, it deserves to be looked into. A Lawyer tells me he hath seen it, and a Gentleman tells me hath sworn in the Court *by lifting up the hand*; whether the Law binds only to this form of *laying*, &c. I know not, but I could never yet learn the meaning of this form of swearing. If the Christians did it in *Chrysostom's* time upon the *Book of the Gospel*, and the *Jews* upon the *Book of the Law*, as Mr. *Falkner* saith, to be sure we find the Scripture mentioning more than one *Form* of swearing. Sometime *Abraham* lifts up his hand, *Gen.* 14.22. another time we find him, *bidding his servant put his hand under his thigh*, Gen. 24.2. that is, *my Master made me swear.* Thus *Israel* makes *Joseph*, Gen. 47.29, 31. put *his hand under his thigh.* So *the giving the hand under Solomon*, 1 Chron. 29.24. is by some interpreted, that the Princes sware unto *Solomon*; as we take the Oath of Allegiance to our King; the custom of several Countries is various in this point, in which we are indifferent; though I know some refuse to swear at all; unless it be by *lifting up the hand*; but the Scripture hath not so tyed us up, we see.

2*ly.* But

2ly. But that he ſaith *theſe ſigns belong not to the eſſence of an Oath*; certainly he is miſtaken; theſe ſigns have a cauſal influence into the effect, the Oath. For, he that gives the Oath doth not ſwear; the perſon to whom the Oath is given, ſwears not by *words*; then take away theſe *ſigns*, and where is the Oath?

Again, *p.* 220, 221. *He tells us of Ceremonies the Parliament appointed, and Miniſters uſed in giving the ſolemn Oath and Covenant.*

As firſt, *The whole Congregation uncovered.*

Anſ. Then it ſeems they were not againſt *decent geſtures.* It was in a ſolemn piece of Worſhip of God, at the adminiſtring of *Baptiſm*, the whole Congregation ſit uncovered, and who oppoſes it?

2ly. *Standing*, and very meet, not to ſit when they are thus dealing with God in ſuch a ſolemn manner; we like reverent geſtures well in theſe caſes; the Parents *ſtand* at the Infants baptizing, there is a *Covenant* made.

3ly. *It is the right hand*; this and not the *left*, is attributed to God, *Pſal.* 17. 7. & *Pſal.* 98. 1. where it is not determined which hand in Scripture we will take, which hand our ſuperiours pleaſe; but if *manuum fortior eſt dextra*; why not that?

4ly. *The hand muſt be bare*; If the *hand* muſt be lifted up, let us ſee the *hand*, not the *glove*. If *Vanimus* were to ſwear, it may be he hath under his glove ſome writing that he owns no God at all, as he and his Diſciples taught; ſo others might have ſomething quite croſs to the Covenant that did ſwear the contrary, be the Covenant never ſo holy and paſt diſpute, as ſome did queſtion this. Theſe are but trifles.

But *p.* 106. he tells us, (and this is that which Mr. *Falkner* and all may e uſe of, as an argument againſt us), *The things commanded are indifferent, and remain ſo after they are commanded in their own nature, no neceſſity put upon them.* Upon which, to illuſtrate the ſtrength of his argument, and ſhow the *Knavery* of the non-conforming Miniſters, (for they muſt be the perſons in the *Reddition* whom he intends) he gives his Reader an elegant ſimilitude, *Part* 1. *pag.* 107.

If you (ſaith he) *who are a maſter in your family, will have your ſervants come in to worſhip God at ſuch a time in the Parlor, not in their Frocks, in which they rub'd your horſes heels, but in their Liveries, this is but reaſonable; it is indifferent in it ſelf, all one to God whether the hours be ten or eleven, but you appoint Ten; whether in the Hall or Parlour. If your ſervant would not come in at Ten, or into Parlor, (being thus indifferent) were not this ſervant guilty of contempt, and faulty? If your ſervants were ſuch fools, and cannot underſtand common ſenſe, they are the more to be pitied; but yet thoſe Knaves that abuſed their*

ſim-

simplicity, and instilled these principles, deserve to be punished, and put out of his service, &c. I leave you to apply this cast, &c.

Ans. This apt similitude of the *Frock*, wherehy the *Fr. Deb.* would illustrate the Knavery of the Nonconformists, puts me in mind of a story which a Conformist and neighbour-Minister told me, being about four years standing in the Colledg of *Dublin*, when the thing was done. A Laundress bringing home a Scholars Linnen, instead of his Surplice, leaves him a Smock, (I suppose unwittingly), *Dr. Chappel* was then Provost (if that be the title they give the Head) of the Colledg; if it were that *Chappel*, who was fellow of *Christs* Colledg in my time, he was a severe man indeed, and fit for Bishop *Laud's* purpose. The Bell ringing to Chappel early in Winter-time, the Lad puts on the Smock (and why not? for I suppose the significancy lyes in the whiteness) instead of the Surplice; when he comes into Chappel, the paultry boys were fain to stop their mouths with their Surplices till Service was done, lest they should laugh out-right; but when Service was finished, there was no little noise made in the Chappel. The Doctor hearing it, sent to know what the matter was? answer is returned; the Lad is sent for, he makes his excuse; but that would not serve his turn, the Lad was punished (I forgot to ask the kind of punishment); as for the Smock, he sends for an Officer that belonged to the Kitchin, and caused a fire to be made, and there burnt the Smock. Had the Doctor ordered it to be burnt to *Tinder*, and not to *ashes*, he might have made as significant a Ceremony of it, though it was *black*, as his *white* Surplice was. And I may say of it as it is said of these Ceremonies, *they are so set forth, that every man may understand what they mean.*

I commend you Sir, this is like a Disputant, you have maintained *Bartholomew*-day very stoutly. But Sir,

The Nonconforming Ministers are not the *Knaves*, as your *Reddition* make them; they hate the *Frock*, it doth smell so of the Jades in the Stable at *Rome*; they will by no means come into the Parlor with the *Frock*; so that he that wears the *Frock* in the Parlor, is either the *Fool* or the *Knave*, according to your Logick.

2*ly.* We call them *Knaves* who *cheat* the persons with whom they deal. I do not call you *Knave*, I have learned more *morality* than so, which you so much talk of; but that you have cheated your Reader, I shall make it appear.

1. With that piece of Sophistry called πολυζήτησις, here are *Time*, *Place*, and *Livery*, *i. e.* your Surplice, put together as if there were no difference, when as we deny it. *Time* and *Place* are but *circumstances*, inseparable from the Worship of God; hence 'tis all one to us,

whether nine, ten, or eleven of the Clock; whether in the Hall or *Parlor*; if it be best for edification, or conveniency of the Church, we are very indifferent; but the Livery hath a *moral signification*, ordained by men for another end, to put us in mind of our Duty to God, and a means to stir up our dull minds to the performance of it.

2. Here is *Ignoratio Elenchi*, your similitude doth not touch the state of the question; the question speaks of one thing, and your similitude argues another.

That by this *Livery* you must understand some Ceremony, and if any, the *Surplice*, must be the *Argutum*, is plain, for that suits a Livery best; and something you would argue, as you declare when you bid *the Reader make the Reddition*. In this sense your similitude is very apt, it doth represent a Livery indeed, but I pray who gives this Livery? we can well distinguish between what comes through *Rome*, and that which is *Romish*. Why do you speak so against that *Woman* in *Rev.* 17. since you wear her Livery?

But to this *indifferency*, that the *use* of them is indifferent, I suppose you will not say; you declare your mind plain enough; *They are indifferent, and so remain after they are commanded in their own nature, no necessity put upon them.* To Mr. *Falkner* and this Author.

I pray tell us what Ceremony you can invent that is not indifferent in its *own nature*; tell us of one Ceremony that is *necessary* in its own nature.

1. All Gods Ceremonies were indifferent in their own nature, not one necessary; let but God recall his *Positive* Law, I will put on all the High Priests garments, and make use of any Vessels of the Temple, *&c.* Pray, Sir, name that Ceremony which in its *own nature* is morally good or evil.

2*ly.* Bread and Wine in the Lords Supper, as to their own nature are but indifferent, unless you will own *Transubstantiation*; his positive Law make them necessary, both *necessitate præcepti, & medii.* When the Elements have served their *use* or *end*, the Sacrament's over, we eat and drink what remains, as other drink, &c. you make yours a *means* to edification, as well as Christ doth his; and so much *necessity* of command lye upon them, that all the Ministers (whom you call Knaves) that will not use them, be the Ministers never so able and holy, they must be turned out of their Lords service by your verdict, as they are.

3*ly.* All the Popish Ceremonies are indifferent in their own nature, and may plead as much for the use of them all, as you do for yours. Yea, take their Pictures; being in a *Papists* house, I saw the Picture of a very Old man, I thought nothing of it, the Cloth, the Paint or Colours,

Colours, the Effigies, the frame, were all indifferent in their nature; but when one told me that Picture was to represent the *Ancient of Days*, then I understood sin enough in it.

4*ly*. The *Papists* put no necessity upon their Ceremonies, as witness their Master *Lombard*, that tells you Baptism, *i. e.* Water applied in the Name, *&c.* the *Elementum & Verbum*, meeting together, make the Ordinance perfect without any Ceremony.

But since they are thus *indifferent*, as you say, and Mr. *Carve* blaming us for making a Schism, because of these, which he terms thus, *Trifles, poor needless things, such as scarce come nigh to touch the fringe of Christs vesture*. But to us they appear sinful; and did we not so apprehend the things imposed upon us, but that we might be acceptable and pleasing to God in our Conformity to them, we protest in his presence who searcheth our hearts, and will judg both you and us, we would not stay one day from Conformity. The Question is, *Whether you may better lay by these things, and not impose them, being so indifferent; or may we better take them up, who at least suspect them to be sinful, and cannot with a clear conscience yield unto them?*

Are *we* more guilty of *schism* that will not take up these things because we apprehend them from the *word* to be *sinful*, or *you*, that will not lay them down, but impose them, though you say they are *indifferent*? I challenge Mr. *Falkner* and all the Conformists to answer it before God.

If the things imposed be but *indifferent*, as all the Conformists say, then Mr. *Falkner* meets with an argument of the *Nonconformists*; it is urged saith Mr. *Falkner*, p. 434 *No such indifferent things ought to be imposed, but to be made the matter of mutual forbearance, according to the duty charged upon Christians*, Rom. 14. & 1 Cor. 8.

Here Mr. *Falkner* bestows about 32 *Pages* to take off the Argument, and to give us the mind of those Chapters.

It is very true, Sir, the argument hath been used by the old *Nonconformists*, and in particular I knew it urged by one, and the 13*th* v. of the 1 *Cor*. 8. pressed hard upon the Prelate *Laud* in his Visitation; to whom the Prelate gave this answer: *True, when* Paul *was alone, and spake alone, thus he said; but would* Paul *have said so, if he had been in a Consistory with the rest of the Apostles?* my friend made no reply, but held down his head, supposing thereby he might make the Prelate recall his words; this answer was becoming an Archbishop, and worthy of *Laud*! To be sure he silenced my friend.

Only this, Sir, let me say, they used the argument upon your Hypothesis, *that the things are indifferent*; but though we grant the things considered absolutely, or abstractedly in their own nature are *indifferent*;

ferent; yet consider them in their use, we look on them as *sinful*.

To examine all that learned Mr. *Falkner* hath written, would be tedious and needless, for I should yield to him in many things, had not the state of the question been mistaken.

Briefly therefore I will consider the case the Apostle had before him, and apply our case to it.

The Lord having in the old Law forbidden divers *meats*, and commanded the observation of divers *days*, when Christ the substance, the body was come, these *shadows* vanished. Some Believers in Christ understood this; they knew, though once they were under a Law, yet at *this time* they were *indifferent*, and so they knew their liberty. Others, because the Law was so express, the observation had been many hundred years, the words *for ever* added to those Laws, they could not yet understand what the stronger Christians did. The Apostle guided by the Spirit of Christ, chargeth these stronger Christians not to judg, despise, refuse, or offend these weaker Christians; but to receive them into their hearts, into Church-fellowship, and all Church communion, and not perplex their minds with those doubtful disputations or reasonings, but wait, and bear tenderly with them, till the Lord shall reveal that truth also unto them.

For our case; the things in question are no necessary circumstances of Divine Worship, as *time, place, &c.* which are necessary attendants of Worship, and Antecedaneous to any act of mans *will*; but such as have their dependance upon *mans pleasure only*. Hence you tell us, you *may change them when you please*. Those things fell under the command of God; and so not *these*, unless as forbidden by the general Law of God, as those *meats* were by particular Laws. For a *man*, a *creature*, to institute a Doctrinal, Religious Ceremony, to teach men their duty they owe to God; ordain it as a mean to help, stir up their minds to their duty, and annex this to the worship of God; yea so as there must be no Divine Worship unless it is Ceremony be used, it is such high boldness, it doth so touch the Lords Prerogative, and tacitely so charge him with defect of wisdom, as if he had not appointed means sufficient to teach his Creature, but we must supply his defect *by adding to his word*; that let *superstition* speak never so smoothly, as it always comes with some *pious end* in the mouth, it is no other but wretched *impiety*, nor will we by the help of his Grace conform unto it.

You who tell us these things are *indifferent*, are yet so far from answering the Duty that Christ commands by the Apostle in these Chapters, *i. e.* to *receive* us, *not to judg us*, *not to offend us*, that in opposition to the command, you thrust us out of the Lords work; you

shut

ſhut us out from the Sacraments; you excommunicate us, impriſon us, and do what in you lye to deſtroy us both ſoul and body.

As to what you ſay, *p.* 410. quoting Mr. *Thorndike*, with whom you agree, *It is not meant a bare diſpleaſing of our Brother, but doing ſuch actions which tend to occaſion ſome to fall from Chriſtianity, diſguſt Chriſtian Religion, for which you quote the* 15. *v. Deſtroy not him, &c.*

The firſt part in ſome ſenſe I ſhould yield; but for the latter part which carries this ſenſe, that the *deſtruction* in the 15. *v.* was by making them to *fall from Chriſtianity*, as if there were no other way to deſtroy them but that; I conceive humbly that your ſelf with Mr. *Thorndike*, are both miſtaken.

For that weak Chriſtian might be ſtrongly convinced that Chriſtian Religion was true, though he could not as yet ſee the repealing of thoſe Laws upon the reaſons I gave before; yet through the unkindneſs, pride, cruelty of the ſtronger Chriſtians who would judg, deſpiſe him, and not receive him unleſs he would eat the *forbidden meats*, as they did; and through their example, whom he ſaw to eat, he might be put upon a temptation to eat ſuch meats too, not *in faith*, but with a *doubtful conſcience*, and ſo doing, he was *condemned* according to the laſt *verſe*. So their pride, unkindneſs, and example, did help to deſtroy their brother as much as in them lay.

Hence in the firſt verſe of the Chapter, the Apoſtle charges them not to trouble ſuch a one with *doubtful* diſputations: Μὴ εἰς διακρίσεις, *&c.* * In the laſt verſe he ends with, *He that doubteth*, διακρινόμενος, *is damned*; ſo that he begins and ends with *doubtfulneſs*. Now had the weak Chriſtian fallen off from the Faith, the weak Chriſtian would not have eaten ſuch meats *doubtfully*, and ſo bring himſelf under the danger of condemnation for ſo doing; for to be ſure he would eat none of thoſe meats which made him fall off from Chriſtianity, becauſe he ſaw Chriſtians eat them, there was no danger of his damning for eating with a *doubting conſcience*; ſo that this implys, that he who eats with *doubting*, did yet hold his Chriſtianity.

Thus have ſome by reaſon of that unkindneſs and ſeverity in impoſing theſe Laws upon us, been put upon Subſcriptions with a doubtful Conſcience in their temptations, and afterwards have met with that which hath ſtung them. This is the *charity* of your Church towards your brethren.

Not doth that you ſay, *p.* 435. help it, viz. *That theſe different practiſes had a peculiar reſpect to thoſe times only, of the firſt dawning of Chriſtianity; for the Church afterwards in their Canons condemned all thoſe who obſerved thoſe Moſaical Laws.*

* *Non cum eo diſputio, de uſu liberiatis quem nondum poteſt intelligere, quod plus anxietatis & haſitationis, rudibus animis parit, quàm utilitatis.* Vatabl.

For

For we are under the ſame condition with thoſe Chriſtians who dare not eat the meat *then*, becauſe they had been forbidden in the Law; ſo, nor dare we ſubmit to your Humane Inventions in the Worſhip of God, becauſe they are forbidden in the general Law, *Thou ſhalt not add*, Deut. 12. 32. *They are not according to Chriſt*, Col. 2. 8. Chriſt put no ſuch things into the Apoſtles Commiſſion to Preach, *Mat.* 28. *ult.* So that with a *doubtful conſcience* at leaſt we muſt practiſe them; and what is next, we know.

Nor doth your obedience to authority help here, which ſo many are glad they have that ſtarting hole to run into, and your ſelf ſo much urge. Had theſe *ſtrong* brethren in this, *Rom.* 14. been Princes, or Archbiſhops, and they ſhould have commanded the weak brethren to have eat theſe *meats*, they had ſinned in their command; nor were they bound to obey them with a *doubtful conſcience*; to hazard damnation by obedience to ſuperiors, is no good Divinity. Yet, Sir, we do give obedience, and will preach up obedience to Princes, as much as any other, only in the matters of God, he is the ſuperior and ſupreame eſt, *Nemini ſit injuria, cui præponitur Deus.*

For your next Section, *pag.* 442. where you labour to defend your Ceremonies, though they have been abuſed in a corrupt way of worſhip in Popery. As for this Section Mr. *Falkner* might have ſpared it; for Humane Doctrinal Ceremonies to be annexed to Gods own Inſtitutions, we judg them ſinful additions, intrenching upon the Soveraignty, and ſlighting of the wiſdom of Chriſt, though *Rome* had never known them; as if the wiſe holy God could not have appointed more Doctrinal Ceremonies, had he cared for them, as well as fooliſh ſinful man; but ſince then theſe were and are ſtill in the Popiſh worſhip, and retained here when *England* threw off the Papal yoke, I will conſider what he hath ſaid, and but touch it briefly.

1. *Rome* then, as now it ſtands, is that Whore deſcribed *Apoc.* 17. 1. this I doubt not; of this judgment were our *Engliſh* Biſhops, the moſt learned of them, the Profeſſors of Divinity in both Univerſities, and generally of our pious and learned men in this Nation, before our troubles began; and alſo of foreign Divines. Was it ever known that a chaſt Virgin, as the Church ſhould be to Chriſt, 2 *Cor.* 11. 2. would dreſs up her ſelf with the reliques of a known Whore? *Come out of her my people*, Apoc. 18. 4. this is not obedience to that call.

2*ly*. It ſeems very ſtrange that when Gods own Inſtitution came to be abuſed to Idolatry, as the Brazen Serpent, 2 *King.* 18. 4. that muſt now be broken in pieces; and muſt a Humane Inſtitution uſed in ſuperſtitious worſhip, in an Idolatrous Church, be yet retained in a Reformed Church?

I ſhall

I ſhall not write out his Argument at length.

1ſt. *In Regeneration the bodies and ſoulz once abuſed to the ſervice of the Devil, Luſt, Idolz, may yet find acceptance with God, in ſerving of him.*

Anſ. A ſtrange argument for a learned man! If ſo excellent a Creature as man, made after the Image of God, under a *neceſſity* of obedience to his Creator, being fallen from God, but by Gods rich mercy, the Obedience, Blood, and Sacrifice of *Immanuel*, and the renewing of the holy Ghoſt, be accepted of God; Then a paultry human Ceremony *indifferent* in its own nature, and no *neceſſity* for the uſe, if abuſed in an Idolatrous Church, may yet be retained in a chaſt Church, and the uſe of it acceptable to God. This Logick I underſtand not: Conſequence denied. I could enlarge my anſwer, but will not.

2d. *Arg. From ſingle merſion, and threefold merſion in baptizm.*

A. Was the *water*, *ſo baptizing in water*, a Human Ceremony and Invention, or Chriſts own Inſtitution? For dipping in the water, or pouring of the water upon the perſon, your Church allow both, becauſe the word *Βαπτίζω* ſignifie both. If any did dip thrice, denying the Trinity of perſons to be of the ſame eſſence, that was their Hereſie: but if any did hold the Trinity of perſons in the Unity of the eſſence, and yet would dip thrice, though I do not much like it, yet I ſhould not condemn them of Hereſie, the Text mentions nothing, whether once, or thrice. But prove *Baptizing in water* to be mans invention.

3ly. *The Chriſtians lawfully uſed thoſe fountains where the Gentilz drew water for their Sacrifices, &c.*

A. And why not? did the Heathen and *Julian* make thoſe Fountains, or God make them for the uſe of Man and Beaſt? ſhall therefore an Idolater deprive the Chriſtians of thoſe which God made for the uſe and neceſſity of Man and Beaſt, *What is ſold in the ſhambles?* 1 Cor. 12. 25. But this you are to prove, if you will make an Argument of it, that when the Idolaters had taken water out of thoſe Fountains, carried it to their Idol-Temples, made uſe of it in their Idol worſhip, that then the Chriſtians would take *that* water, and baptize believers in it; though yet there is more to be ſaid for them, than for your Ceremonies, becauſe to *baptize in water*, was Chriſts Inſtitution. For the fountains, *Julian* might have Dedicated the Land thereabouts to Idols, and Devils, as well as the Fountains, and ſo the Chriſtians ſhould be afraid to ſow Corn to maintain Life.

4ly. *We meet in their Churches or places they built, uſe their Bells, Tenths, for maintenance of Miniſters.* Ergo.

A.

A. 1. For places. 1*ſt*. *Place* hath no moral ſignification, as your Ceremonies. 2. Place is *neceſſary*, ſo not your Ceremonies. 3. Thoſe places were built for the worſhip of the true God and Chriſt; though theſe blind Idolaters might alſo intend ſome Saint: But if they had been built *only* for the worſhip of a Saint, in imitation of the Heathens *Demons*, we would not meet in them, but done by them as *Conſtantine* did by the Idols Temples, razed ſome to the ground, and ſhut up others.

2. *Bells.* It ſeems you uſe them all the while you are reading Prayers, and worſhipping God in your Surplice, the Bells are Chiming: I thought the Bells had done when worſhip began.

2. Something muſt be done to give notice to the people what time the worſhip of God begins; ſo the Bell doth this day; to morrow it calls the people to a meeting about Town-affairs

3. Bells have no moral ſignification in them, as your Ceremonies.

4. I believe few Bells in *England*, but have been caſt ſince the throwing off Popery, to make them muſical; and none uſe them for that end. No ſuch muſical tunes did I obſerve in *Spain*, but a confuſed jangling in time of Thunder.

3. *Tenths*, Miniſters maintenance, have no moral ſignification, nor annexed to Divine Worſhip. The people tell you, *Tenths* are *Levitical*, not *Popiſh*. Though, by their favour, twice we read of Tenths being paid to God before the *Levitical* Law. But for maintenance, poor *Nonconformiſts* are not concern'd in this argument.

4 *The Heathens lifted up their eyes when they worſhipped their Idols, their gods, Sun, Moon,* &c.

A. 1. Did the Heathen call a Convention, and there decree, That when men did worſhip God, they ſhould lift up their eyes to heaven as your Convocation appointed theſe? or did *Natures light* teach them this geſture?

2. Were the Heathens the *firſt* that in worſhipping of Idols lifted up their eyes to heaven? Did not *Adam*, *Abel*, and the Saints before the Flood; and *Noah*, *Sem*, &c. after it, lift up their eyes in their worſhipping of God? If the Heathen will imitate the Church, muſt the Church lay by duty? becauſe the Heathen worſhip Devils, therefore we muſt not worſhip God?

5 *Idolatrous ſacrifices were practiſed before the giving of the Law, yet God continued and commanded ſacrifices after the Law.*

A. Your Argument ſpeaks thus much: If the Devil will be Gods Ape, and hateful enemy, then God muſt have no worſhip; and every time the Devil imitates Gods worſhip, God muſt change his worſhip, and appoint *new* means of worſhip.

I pray

I pray Sir, did the Devil, or God firſt appoint *Sacrifices*? why may I not think the Devil underſtood ſomething of the promiſed ſeed, and the meaning of the Sacrifices; and in the following Ages, in hatred and revenge againſt God, and hatred of ſouls, drew men to ſacrifice to himſelf, not only beaſts, but *men*, as being the beſt of Creatures, and ſo moſt acceptable Sacrifice, in the imitation of *Iſaac*, that ſhould have been ſacrificed? and thus he got before God.

Sir, I pray do this: ſhew us where there were Ceremonies firſt invented by Idolators, depending only on their *wills* (as yours do, and you tell us you may change them when you pleaſe) theſe were uſed in idalatrous worſhip, and the Church of God tranſlated thoſe Ceremonies (I do not mean individual) from the idolatrous Temples into the worſhip of the holy and true God, and he approved of them. This you muſt prove, or elſe you ſpeak not home to our Caſe.

The laſt thing Mr. *Falkner* brings, is the Teſtimony of worthy men about retaining *ſome Ceremonies*, &c. I only ſay, I honour the men; but I am of Mr. *Falkner's* opinion, that the holy Scriptures are the only unerring *Rule*, and I will willingly follow them; ſo men, where they follow Chriſt.

Several Diſtinctions about ſignificant ſigns, Mr. *Falkner* makes; but I ſee not how any of them reach the Queſtion, no not ſo much as one.

1. Here are ſigns depending only on the *Wills* of *Men*.

2. Theſe ſigns are Inſtituted to Inſtruct us in our Duty towards God.

3. Theſe are ſaid to be helps for our Edification.

4. Theſe ſigns are appropriated and annexed to the Worſhip of God. While we Adminiſter *his ſigns*, we ſet up *our ſigns*.

5. He that uſeth not theſe ſigns, is turned out of the work of the Lord, and ſhall not worſhip the Lord.

I deſire Mr. *Falk.* would either from expreſs Scripture, or neceſſary conſequence from Scripture, or from the example of any holy and ordinary perſons in Scripture approved by God; I ſay, I deſire from either of theſe he would prove ſuch ſigns in this manner Impoſed. Did *Moſes* ever dare to Inſtitute one *Exciting* (which is one Diſtinction) ſign, and annex it to the worſhip of God, more than he had in charge from God? yea and turn out thoſe Prieſts that would not uſe it?

It is ſaid of your Ceremonies, *they are not Dark and Dumb, but ſo ſet forth, that every man may underſtand what they mean.*

May *every* man underſtand, &c? truly I have known the Surplice above fifty years, but never underſtood that the putting on a Sur-

place ſhould properly ſignifie the *Reverence* we bear to God, and the *high eſteem of his ordinances*, till Mr. *Falk.* told me ſo, p. 391. nor I believe did few Preiſts ſo underſtand it.

It ſeems then when you put *off* the Surplice, going into Pulpit, now you declare a lower eſteem of God and his Ordinances.

Others tell us, it ſignifies *Purity*; others *Decency*; it ſeems you are not agreed in the ends of your own inventions.

But for your *exciting* ſign in the *Croſs*; many thouſands, if not millions of Children in *England* have been baptized with this ſign. I pray Name but *One* of theſe that ever was *Excited* to fight under Chriſts Banner, by this ſign. *Reaſon* is a word in which the Conforming party glory much; all Learning and Reaſon they have engroſſed. I pray, Sir, ſhew us the Reaſon, how the moving of a Prieſts finger over an Infants Fore-head, in its Baptiſm, comes to have that efficacy to *excite* that Infant to fight under Chriſts Banner? How the Chriſtians of old uſed the *real* ſign of the Croſs, I know (I do not go about to juſtifie or condemn their practiſe) but this is another thing, or ſhadow of a thing; no wonder though your own Mr. *Carr* calls your Ceremonies *trifles*, things of which come no good. Surely, Sir, while you ſpeak of the *Reverence* of God, we ſhould ſhow more Reverence to that Majeſty, in being content with his Soveraignty and wiſdom in his own Inſtitutions, and not annex vain empty trifles to them, and turn out thoſe men who will not ſubmit unto them.

CHAP. III.

THE next thing required of us, is our ſubjection to the *Eccleſiaſtical Government*, conſiſting of *ſix* diſtinct Officers (or more) that exerciſe Church-power; and holy Writ knows but *one* of them: In the Commonwealth none dare pretend to Office, but only ſuch as the King and the Law authorize and appoint; if there ſhould be any other, their power and actions were null, invalid, and they liable to puniſhment. But in the Church men can be more bold. Here Dr. *Stillingfleet's* notion, if true, muſt help us, *viz. That Chriſt hath appointed or determined no* form *of Government in the Church, but left it to the chief Magiſtrates, or Church-governours to appoint the form*, &c. the deſign of his *Irenicon*.

In that learned Piece there are ſeveral things I muſt yield to, as, *That the power of Ordination is proper to the name πρεσβύτερος, and not ἐπίσκοπος*, p. 285. To which let me add what Mr. *Samuel Smith*, a Miniſter dead above 20 years ſince, told us, he with many others, being

ing at one time Ordained by the Biſhop of *Peterborough*, the Biſhop bad them all take notice, *That he did not Ordain as Biſhop, but as Presbyter*; this Mr. *Smith* would take his Oath to be true; yet Biſhop *Gauden* told me, *The power of Ordination was ſolely in the Biſhop, and though Presbyters did impoſe hands with the Biſhop, it was out of courteſie.* Thank you, Sir! I am not to meddle with this now. I preſume he would defend this as well as he did the *Jus Divinum* of Epiſcopacy, in the ſeveral ſheets that paſſed betwixt us upon the queſtion; but whence then comes *Reordination* to the ſame office in the ſame Church? a thing unknown to *Fathers*, *Councils*, *Papiſts*, *Lutherans*, *Calviniſts*, but only to this new Edition of Conformiſts.

2*ly*. I ſhall yield alſo to him in this, *That it is not neceſſary there ſhould be ſo many particular Churches as particular Congregations.* And this is a queſtion of great moment. Of this a word hereafter.

3*ly*. I agree alſo with him, *That the power of Order and Juriſdiction is committed by Chriſt* ex æquo, *to all Miniſters of the Goſpel* actu primo, *or habitually*, p. 197. 198, 275.

By this we may underſtand what he means by *Church Governours* in the Queſtion. To which I ſhall ſpeak but briefly, though I had prepared a larger diſcourſe upon it. Three things then I would prove,

1. That Chriſt hath appointed a *Form* of Government in his Church.

2*ly*. I will ſhew what that form is, and this will prove the firſt.

3*ly*. That form is *Jure Divino*. Conſequently if this Eccleſiaſtical Government which we are required to ſubject to, be not according to that Form, then I hope they will not blame us though we refuſe to ſubject unto it, as we would refuſe ſubjection to one in the Commonwealth, who is not an Officer according to Law.

Profeſſing withal for my ſelf, and I dare ſay for all the *Nonconformiſts* in *England*, that if it can be made good that Chriſt hath appointed ſuch a Government in his Church, we will moſt willingly ſubject unto it, being glad we are eaſed of ſuch a burden. Pride ſhall never hinder us, though that be ſo much charged upon us.

For the *firſt*, the *Doctor* meets with ſeveral arguments that ſome have produced to prove there *muſt be a Form appointed*, and he anſwers them; but his anſwers do not ſatisfie. I had prepared a reply to his anſwers, but lay it by.

To their Arguments I would add one or two more.

Firſt, if Chriſt hath determined no form of Government in his Church, then the Form may be *Monarchical*; and *Bellarmine*'s argument to prove it for the prevention of *Schiſm*, will carry it; *a ſimili*, ſaith he, *&c. de Rom. Pontif. l. 1. c. 9.* Dr. *Stillingfleet* might have

ſpared the *ſeventh Chapter* of his *Rational Account*, wherein he labours to diſprove the Jeſuit, arguing for the *Monarchical* Form.

Kings are ſupream in all caſes Eccleſiaſtical, ſays the Church of *England*; the ſupream Magiſtrate may determine the Form, ſays Doctor *Stillingfleet*, then the *Ten Kings may give their power to the Beaſt* without any error.

A Paſtor and a Deacon may ſerve at firſt, while believers are few; but when the Church is enlarged to a whole Nation, there muſt be another Form of Government, ſaith the Doctor, *p.* 180. *Irenic.* Go on, Sir; when the Church is enlarged to many Nations, there may be another Form; and why not then *Monarchical?* Chriſt having determined none, as the Doctor ſaith.

Above one thouſand Presbyters in a Dioceſs may devolve the exerciſe of that power which Chriſt hath committed to them *actu primo* to one perſon, according to Dr. *Stillingfleet*; ſo may ten thouſand as well, for ought I know, to one Biſhop, and he may exerciſe it by his Arch-deacon, Chancellor, Commiſſaries, as well as now.

2*ly*. If God determine a Form of Government in the *Jewiſh* Church, then Chriſt in the *Chriſtian Church*. Chriſts Kingly-Government in the heart, is ſecret, none can *ſee* that; his viſible Government by which he is made known to the world, is known by his Ordinances, Government of his Houſe, (as our Courts at *Weſtminſter*, Seſſions, and Aſſizes, ſhew our Kings Government) with the Profeſſion of the Chriſtian Faith, and converſation of Chriſtians accordingly. He is *faithful in his houſe*, *Heb.* 3. 6. that *Houſe* is his Church, which he builds, not the Commonwealth; *qua ſic*.

3*ly*. To determine a Form of Government, argues more *Soveraignty*, more *Perfection*, more *Wiſdom* in the ſupream Governour, than to appoint only an unformed Government; as it were a meer *materia prima*.

If a Prince give a Charter to a Corporation, a Patent to a Colony, he appoints the form of their Government. He that gives the *form* in other things, gives the *perfection* of the thing. Chriſts Form in the Church carries authority, and hath an awe upon the hearts of Believers; this notion brings Chriſt in his wiſdom and Soveraignty below an earthly Prince.

4*ly*. Dr. *Stillingfleet* hath affirmed Chriſt hath appointed a *form* of Government in his Church; for whereas the Jeſuit is pleading for the *Monarchical form* of the Church-Government, becauſe wiſe men have thought that to be beſt; the Doctor anſwers, *What is this to the proving what Government Chriſt hath appointed in his Church? for that is the beſt Government of the Church, not which Philoſophers and Politicians have thought beſt, but which our Saviour hath appointed in his word.*

Ration.

Ration. Account, p. 464. then Chriſt hath appointed a form in his word, (and I hope that is *Jure Divino*) elſe the Jeſuit is not anſwered. We need no more proof.

2. For the ſecond Queſt. *What then is that form? A.* I ſhall lay ſeveral Propoſitions, and clear them by Scripture.

Firſt Prop. *In all Churches in the New Teſtament, where we read of Elders, we read of ſeveral Elders in one Church; we never read but of one Elder in a Church*, that I call to mind.

1. In the Church of *Jeruſalem*; *one* Church, but divers Elders, *Act.* 15. 6, 23, *v.* & 16. *ch.* 4.

2*ly*. In the Church of the *Romans*, one Church, but ſeveral Elders, as *Rom.* 12. 6, *&c.*

3*ly*. In the Church at *Antioch*, one Church, but more Elders, *Act.* 13. 1.

4*ly*. In the Church of *Corinth* there were divers Elders, witneſs the *Schiſm.*

5*ly*. In the Church of *Epheſus*, divers Elders, *Act.* 20. 17.

6*ly*. In the Church of *Philippi* were ſeveral Elders, *Phil.* 1. 1. So *Polycarpus*'s Epiſtle to the Church declares.

7*ly*. In the Church of the *Coloſſians*, ſeveral Elders, *Col.* 1. 7. & 4. 17. *Epaphras*, and *Archippus*, we are ſure of; the *Dutch* ſay *Oneſimus* alſo, from *Ch.* 4. 9.

8*ly*. In the Church of the *Theſſalonians* were ſeveral Elders, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 12. Let any man that oppoſes me produce one Church where there was but *one* ſingle Paſtor; though if it were ſo, it will not ſave us; for the Churches then had the Apoſtles living among them, and could help that ſingle Paſtor, if the Church were but new planted.

9*ly*. In *Act* 14. 23. *The Apoſtles ordained them Elders* (not an Elder) *in every Church*. Mr. *Thorndike*, one of your own, joining this Text with *Tit.* 1. 5. croſſes Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s gloſs on the Text, *i. e.* ſaith the Doctor, *no Church wanted an Elder, not that every Church had more Elders*; but Mr. *Thorndike* thus, *not meaning one Elder in a place, but Presbyteries, Colledg of Presbyters, with common advice to order the Churches planted in thoſe cities.* This agrees with the plain Gramar of the Text; 2. with eight examples I gave before; 3*ly*. The *Syriack* is full for our ſenſe.

The *Doctor* while he labours to darken this Text, forgets himſelf ſtrangely; for *p.* 239. He lays this for *a foundation to clear the Apoſtolical practiſe* viz. *that the Apoſtles in framing Churches did obſerve the cuſtoms of the* Jewiſh *Synagogues*. And p. 248. *Having cleared that there was a peculiar form of Government in the Synagogues, and that the Apoſtles copied out the Government of the Chriſtian Churches by them.* Now

p. 429,

p 429. *he tells us there were divers Rulers in a Synagogue, is evident from* Act. 13. 15. he ſuppoſes, *Ten wiſe men did jointly concur for ruling the affairs of the Synagogue.* p. 250. *ſo many Elders to make a Bench.* Strange the Doctor ſhould forget his *foundation!*

For *Act.* 20. 17. Dr. *Stillingfleet*, Dr. *Hammond*, with *Irenæus*, darken that Text. I might have ſhown how croſs Dr. *Hammond* and *Ireneus* are one to another. Forſooth the Biſhops of *Aſia* (not only the Elders of *Epheſus*) were ſent for according to *Hammond*. *Grotius* is clear againſt *Hammond*, *de Imper.* p. 343, 393.

But I ſhould anſwer thus:

1. Conſider how many miles *Philippi* was diſtant from *Jeruſalem*, the way *Paul* ſailed, *&c.* according to *Bunting*, who gives an account of all the miles from Port to Port that *Paul* ſailed, it was two thouſand one hundred and fifty ſix miles, if he miſtake not.

2*ly*. Conſider how many days between the Feaſt of Unleavened bread, and *Penteceſt*, for *Paul* to ſail theſe miles.

3*ly*. What time *Paul* ſet ſail from *Philippi*.

4*ly*. How many days he ſtayed in ſeveral places, all which I had caſt up.

5*ly*. When he came at *Miletum*, thirty days at leaſt were ſpent, he had but twenty days; of theſe he ſtays eight days by the way; beſides two days journey going and coming between *Miletum* and *Epheſus*, as they reckon it; from *Miletum* to *Jeruſalem* 844 miles, according to *Bunting*; he ſtays at *Philips* houſe, *Act.* 21. 8, 10. At *Miletum*, Act. 20. 16. *He haſted if poſſible*, &c. yet now he ſends for the Biſhops of *Aſia*; this is the fancy of that learned man.

Beſides if he can prove that τῆς ἐκκλησίας in the 17 *verſ.* and παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ ἐν ᾧ, and τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἧς, *v.* 28. be words of the Plural Number, then his great learning may perſwade us to ſomething.

For his other notion on *Phil.* 1. 1. the *Jewiſh* and Chriſtian Biſhop, Dr. *Stillingfleet* hath anſwered him. I add,

1. In matter of *fact*; one would think *Chryſoſtom* and *Ambroſe* ſhould know a little better than Dr. *Hammond* of yeſterday, and they could have given other anſwers than they have done upon the Text.

2*ly*. When *Paul*, Phil. 4. 15. ſaith, *O ye Philippians*; he means the ſame perſons in *Ch.* 1. 4. but if one in *France* ſhould write to the *French* Church in *London*, would they write, *O ye Londoners*, they are but ſtrangers, as the *Jews* in *Philippi*.

3. In the Church of *Theſſalonica* there were Elders, 1 *Theſ.* 5. 12. but none *Jewiſh* Chriſtian Biſhops, 1 *Theſ.* 1. 9. *Theſe turned from Idols, &c.* not ſo the *Jews*. So in *Epheſus* ſeveral Elders, but no *Jewiſh* diſtinct Elders, *Epheſ.* 2. 11, 12. make that clear.

I could

I could give more anſwers.——

Prop. 2. *The Elders in the Goſpel-churches had all of them Miniſterial power committed to them alike.* I mean the *ordinary teaching Elders.* So Biſhop *Jewel, If it be a hereſie to ſay that by the Scriptures of God, a Biſhop and Prieſt are all one, then many of the Fathers* (whom he mentions) *yea Paul himſelf muſt be a Heretick.* Dr. *Stilling fleet* hath yielded this, and we deſire no more; the truth is the ſame if he be changed; this queſtion Learned Pens have diſcuſſed, I let it alone.

Prop. 3. *This equality of power which the Elders received from Chriſt did continue all the time the Apoſtles lived.*

This I think Dr. *Stilling fleet* yields, *p.* 275. the Epiſtle of *Clemens* to the *Corinthians* after the Apoſtles time, and of *Polycarpus* to the *Philippians*, declare the ſame.

The Teachers, *Act.* 13. 1, 2, 3. did *Ordain*; ſo ſeveral of the ancient and modern Divines, *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts*, ſo underſtand it; there is a full definition of Ordination. If this were *Peter's*, ſee where is that Biſhop, had there been an Apoſtle, he had been mentioned.

The Church of *Corinth* ought to have Excommunicated the Inceſtuous perſon, though *Paul* had not ſent to them, or here joined with them. *Chryſoſtom* on the Text ſpeaks fully to the point.

Prop. 4. *The number of the Elders increaſing in the Church by reaſon of the increaſe of the Believers; One of theſe Elders, and moſt probably that Elder which was firſt Ordained by the Apoſtles in the Church, had a Primacy, as to order and honour, but not as to power and juriſdiction over his fellow Elders.*

The Text commands it, 1 *Cor.* 14. *ult. Order* muſt be, and where there is a Plurality, to avoid confuſion there muſt be *one.*

If there be Twenty Juſtices of the Peace in a County, and the King add Ten more, it doth not alter the form of Government: At the Seſſions *one* muſt be for *order* ſake the Judg of the Seſſions, and the other Juſtices do not devolve the exerciſe of their power upon him, nor hath he more power than the reſt, every one exerts his own power: So in the Parliament, a *Speaker* muſt be, but no ſuperiority of power, nor devolving the exerciſe of the power of the other Members upon him: ſo it is in the Church.

That Eminent Servant of Chriſt, Mr. *Thomas Hooker*, alloweth of an *Epiſcopus Humanus* in the Conſociation of Churches, to moderate the actions of the Aſſembly, to propound things to be agitated, to gather voices, to pronounce the Sentence which paſſed by common approbation. Reaſon and order ſaith he, forceth ſuch a kind of proceeding, *Survey Chu. Diſc. p.* 1. *Cap.* 2. *p.* 22, 23. only the conſtancy of it he denies from experience. There is the pinch.

Prop. 5.

Prop. 5. *This Primacy* (I humbly conceive) *did continue in that Elder, during his life*, (unleſs for ſome default he were caſt out by his fellow Elders) I ſhall wrangle with none of my brethren, nor differ from them in affection about it, but I ſhall ground my notion on the *Angel* of the Church, *Apoc.* 2. &c.

1*ſt*. The word doth not connote any ſuperiority of power over the reſt, no more than when the King wrote from *Breda*, or at any other time to the *Speaker* of the Houſe of Lords, or Commons, or to the Judg of the Seſſions, did or do argue any ſuperiority of power, but only order; what *Iſidore* ſaith of the word *Angelus*, *Angelorum vox eſt nomen Officii, ne natura,—cum mittuntur vocantur Angeli.* So here, *all Elders are ſent*, *Rom.* 10. 15. if *ſent*, then they are Angels. Superiority of power among the ordinary teaching Elders, was the firſt ſtep Antichriſt took to get into his Chair.

2*ly*. The word is to be taken *individually*, not *collectively*. So famous *Reynolds* againſt *Hart*, *p.* 314. So *Beza*, *Piſcator*, *Pareus*, and many others. The inſtances our brethren give to prove *collectively*, ſome do not prove it; others, as the *Ram*, the *Goat* in *Daniel*, the *Antichriſtian Beaſt*, &c. in the *Revel.* I humbly conceive give away the Cauſe, (for there was ever *one ſuperiour in power*), which I will not yield.

3*ly*. That this perſon was *during life*, &c. The Argument brought againſt it is no Scripture, but *humane Prudence from experience:* ſo Mr. *Hooker*. To which I ſay, keep out but ſuperiority of power, and the danger is avoided: and no doubt while the Churches kept that out, this form of government carried on things very well. You cannot then charge me with being croſs to Scripture in my opinion.

2*ly*. Since you cannot prove me ſo, then I prove my ſenſe from the practice of the primitive Churches, of which we have the Hiſtories, which to me is of great force in proving the ſenſe of a Text, that ſeems very fair, and have no other Scripture to contradict that ſenſe: how much the Hiſtories of them ſpeak of a ſingle perſon, who is ignorant? and that *during life*. *Ambroſe* (or whoever it was, as ancient as he) in his Comment on the 4. *Epheſ.* ſpeaks home to the point, ſee *Theſ. Salmar. p.* 3. *p.* 299.

3*ly*. By the Seven Epiſtles to the Churches, I find him in his Primacy; do you prove it was but for one or two Seſſions, not during his life. Certainly that Angel was well known in the Church to whom Chriſt wrote: in ſome Churches commending him, in others diſcommending; though its true, the Epiſtles concerned the whole Church.

4*ly*. This *Angel* is not the Moderator in a *conſociation of Churches*, as Reverend Mr. *Hooker* ſpeaks of, whoſe conſtancy in the place may

be

be bad, but the Primate among the Elders of *our* particular Church: ſo that his fear does not reach us.

Q. 3. For the *Jus Divinum* of this.

This form Dr. *Stillingfleet* cannot deny the Apoſtles did conſtitute in the Churches; but it ſeems the Apoſtolical practice, though they were guided by the Spirit of Chriſt, is not ſufficient to make a *Jus Divinum*, a *poſitive Law*; for it is demanded.

1*ſt*. There was no *poſitive Law* for the change of the ſeventh-day Sabbath; but yet the Dr. tells us, the Apoſtolical practice is ſufficient, for they were guided by an Infallible Spirit, *p.* 12, 13. If ſo, in a matter of far greater moment than in this, I hope, it is ſufficient, the Dr. cannot deny it.

2*ly*. Dr. *Stillingfleet* denies the 18. *Mat.* 15, 16. proves *Excommunication*: Then what *poſitive Law* hath he for *Excommunications*, *Deacons*, *Ordination* of Church-Officers?

3*ly*. The *Apoſtolical form* did beſt conduce to the *end* of Government, which the Dr. urges much againſt the Jeſuit, *Rat. Account*, *p.* 462.

I pray compare that form then, and our form now; under which did, or do *ignorance* and *prophaneneſs* moſt abound?

4*ly*. If not ſo, then one great end of the Acts of the Apoſtles, which *Oecumenius* calls the *Evangelium Spiritus ſancti*) is loſt.

A Lapide in his Preface to that Book ſpeaks excellently.

5*ly*. I ſet up *this Form*; you demand my authority; I anſwer, It was the Form they ſet up who were guided by an Infallible Spirit, and Chriſt owned the Form in writing to it. You ſet up your Form different from it; I demand of you, ſhew me your authority, and ſee which is beſt.

6*ly*. If Apoſtolical practiſe be not ſufficient, then you may to *Rome* for a Form, for ought I know, I know no ſtop.

As to the Author of the Book *Samaritaniſm*, I am ſure the Author was nothing a-kin to the good *Samaritan*; for he ſhews himſelf a man of a vinegar-ſpirit, his diſcourſe as to Church-Government, is built upon this foundation, *That Form of Government which appeared for hundreds of years, firſt, only, and was* de facto *Inſtituted of God, that only hath Divine right to warrant it*, p. 10, 11. In p. 37. I find this was *Epiſcopacy*, but this is very falſe; theſe three terms, *firſt*, *only*, *and hundreds of years*, are not found in *Epiſcopacy*. The *firſt* Governours had power over Biſhops and Archbiſhops, if any ſuch Creatures were.

2*ly*. They were not the *only* Governours, for the Presbyters governed while the Apoſtles lived.

3ly. The *firſt* Governours did not laſt *hundreds of years.*

4ly. The *firſt* Government was not confined to a narrow Dioceſs, as *Epiſcopacy* was. In *Auguſtine*'s time there were in one Province under *Carthage* of the Catholicks and Donatiſts above nine hundred Biſhops, but their *firſt* Governours had all Nations for their Dioceſs, and that made their Government *Apoſtolical.* I am ſure there is none ſuch now.

Again, *Presbyters* were *firſt* before *Biſhops*; witneſs your own Tribe, that tell the world, Epiſcopacy was ſet up to prevent *Schiſm* among Presbyters after the Schiſm in *Corinth* among the Presbyters.

According to this Author, there is no Government at all in the Church; for theſe three *Terms* are found in no form of Government now; therefore I leave him.

As for his fine language wherewith he courts us, as *Jack-ſtraws, Fools, Knaves, Peeviſh, &c.* this *Samaritans* Oil and Wine, we bear it, *the Diſciple is not above his Maſter.*

There is another Queſtion of very great conſequence, but for theſe times not ſo uſeful, therefore I will only ſtate it, and give mens opinion about it, and leave it, though I had prepared ſomething to ſpeak to it.

Q. *Whether every particular Congregation conſiſting of one teaching Elder, and a number of viſible Chriſtians, be a particular Church, according to the New Teſtament? or may not, yea, ought not ſeveral particular Congregations unite, to make up one particular Church?*

By a Church I mean an *Organical* Church, inveſted with all the power and exerciſe of the Keys within it ſelf, both *quo ad actum primum & ſecundum*; ſuch were the eight Churches I mentioned before.

Learned and pious *Ames*, *Med. Theol. l.* 1. *c.* 39. tells us, *That a Church in the New Teſtament is a Parochial Church; ſuch a company or congregation as ordinarily meet in one place to worſhip God.* (Sure I am that ordinarily there is but one teaching-Elder in ſuch a Church.) *And this Church hath as much power as the National Church of the Jews met together.* Compare his 16 & 18 *Theſes*; great uſe he makes of the words, ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, 1 *Cor.* 11. 20. ſo doth a reverend Brother, who knew my opinion, quote it with a little warmth; but my good Brother muſt prove there was but one Teaching-Elder in that Church, elſe his argument will be guilty of *Ignoratio Elenchi*; five anſwers more I would have given.

Mr. *Tho. Hooker* giving the true ſenſe of *Independency*, ſaith, it *imports thus much, Every particular congregation, rightly conſtituted,*

and

and compleated, hath ſufficiency in it ſelf to exerciſe all the Ordinances of Chriſt. Surv. Ch. Dif. part 2. pag. 80. But then it ſeems it muſt be *compleated*; and to this compleating are required a Paſtor, Teacher, Ruling-Elder, Deacon, one at leaſt of all theſe. So *pag.* 4th. and without theſe, though a particular Congregation may be called a true Church, as a man that hath but one eye, one arm or leg, may be ſtill defined *Animal rationale*, as having a reaſonable ſoul; yet he is but maimed, no intire man; ſuch is that Church, *pag.* 2. *Ibid.* I pray how many ſuch Congregations have we?

The Synod held at *Boſton* in *New England*, Septemb. 10. 1670, the laſt year, *pag.* 10, 11. calling for a full ſupply of Officers in the Churches, ſpeak thus: 'The defect of the Churches on this account is very lamentable, there being in moſt of the Churches only one Teaching Officer, for the burden of the whole Congregation to lye upon. 'The Lord Chriſt would not have inſtituted Paſtors, Teachers, Ruling 'Elders (nor the Apoſtles have ordained Elders in every Church, *Act.* '14. 23. *Tit.* 1. 5.) if he had not ſeen there was need of them for 'the good of his people; and therefore for men to think they can 'do well enough without them, is both to break the ſecond Com-'mandment, and to reflect upon the wiſdom of Chriſt, as if he did 'appoint unneceſſary Officers in his Church. Thus the Synod.

Half the queſtion then is gained, the *Independents* yield it, men worthy to be liſtned to, for they take up the word of God for their *only* Rule. I know there is a great queſtion about the Ruling Elder, but I am not to meddle with it now.

Our Brethren of the *Preſbyterian* judgment, I ſuppoſe, yield the queſtion, *they may and ought* to unite, to make up one *Governing Church*; but I do not fully underſtand their meaning. Suppoſe twenty Pariſhes and Congregations that meet together to worſhip God, and twenty Miniſters belonging to them, are theſe twenty Pariſhes diſtinct Churches as to Word and Sacraments, ſo that he that is Paſtor in one Church, hath nothing to do in another Pariſh, as to feeding them with *Word and Sacraments*, but as to Government and Juriſdiction one Miniſter with the reſt of the Claſſis have power over them all? if this be the meaning, I am not ſatisfied in it.

Dr. *Stilling fleet* hath declared his judgment, they *may unite*. I wiſh he had pleaſed to have opened his mind fully about it.

If he will yield but this, *That conſtitution of a Church wherein a Paſtor cannot poſſibly feed with Word and Sacraments, watch over and govern his flock according to Chriſt, be it Dioceſan or Parochial, that conſtitution is not according to Chriſt, and conſequently unlawful, (as Scripture-light, and nature's light will prove it)* I ſhould, it may be, come

up to him, to perform our duty by *Substitutes*; this may please them who make their *own brains*, not *Gods word*, their rule, and such we little regard.

God hath now brought me to old age in my Pilgrimage; divers disputes about Church-work and Government I have read; absurd, unscriptural practices in Churches I have *seen*; woful disorders and wretched effects I have *heard and known*; great scandal, but so circumstanced, that a single Pastor could not proceed by *Mat.* 18. 15, *&c.* to remove it; I have *met* with one of the ablest Divines in *England*, and exercised in Government, was of the same opinion with me, all arising from this notion of a single Pastor with such a people making a Church; and all which mischiefs might be avoided, if the uniting of several particular Congregations into one particular Church were admitted, which Scripture-examples, and Scripture-reasons will sufficiently justifie.

CHAP. IV.

Of SCHISM.

THere remains yet one thing to be spoken to, *viz.* the great crime of *Schism*, with which we are charged by the *Fr. Deb.* in his first and second Book very deeply; thus also Dr. *Goodman*, and this is the common language of them all, both in Pulpit and Press.

To which I would take liberty to speak more largely: That *Schism* in the Church is a great crime, is readily yielded by understanding men of all parties, and no party will own it, though they be guilty enough of it.

At this day all but Conformists are Schismaticks; but to the Prelatical party this sin is a stranger; yea in the time of our troubles, when they were in *France*, and refused Communion with the *French* Protestant Churches, yet a Prelatical person was not then, nor can be guilty of Schism, but they were Schismaticks in *France*.

What is *Schism?* Dr. *Goodman* tells us, *p.* 112, 113. *Schism is a voluntary separation of ones self without cause given, from that Christian Church whereof once he was a member.*

He opens his Definition, *p.* 113, 114.

First, *It is a separation, &c.* i. e. 'When a man shall refuse to join in

'in the acts and exercises of Religion, used by such a society, and to 'submit to its authority. So he that refuseth Baptism, the Lords-'Supper, or to submit to the censures of the Church. *Thus he.* But what he means by *non-submission to the censures of the Church*, I know not, for I know but few *Nonconformists* that are under the Censures of *their* Church: nor how it will agree with his second: which is,

2*ly*. It must be *voluntary separation*: So that Excommunicate persons are no Schismaticks.

3ly. *It is separation from a particular Church.*

4ly. *Of which Church he was once a member, because Schism imports division, making two of that which was but one before.*

But according to this opening of his definition, I pray Sir, tell us how you will prove us *Schismaticks*?

For take up your third head.

1. I pray tell us what is that *particular* Church you mean, *National, Diocesan, Parochial?*

As for the *National*, I know not how you understand a *National* Church; for as I understand it, you cannot prove us Schismaticks.

For the *Diocesan*, you cannot prove us Schismaticks, unless the refusing to submit to *Prelatical Government* be Schism. (For the Sacraments belong not to a *Diocesan* Church *quâ sic.*) I suppose Dr. *Goodman*'s judgment to be the same with the Doctor that kept the Act at the Commencement at *Cambridg*. I heard so much of one question, that I laboured much to get a view of it, but could not in our parts. A Conformist told me it was to this purpose, *Recessio a regimine Episcopali, est mortale schisma*; he told me, *Damnable schisma*, as it was told him.

I say only this to it: As God gives up some men to monstrous lusts in practise, so he doth others to as monstrous opinions in judgment in these days. So that it must be meant the *Parochial* Church.

But, 2*ly*. I pray prove that we were members once of that *particular* Church you mean. For the *Diocesan*, we deny any such Church (especially as your constitution is) to be according to Christs Institution; and therefore were not, are not members of it.

For the *Parochial* Churches, I pray how are we members of them?

1. Not by our *Baptism*; if that were your meaning, I would soon give arguments to confute it.

2. Not by my dwelling within such a Parish-bounds; though I am for the *Vicinity* of Church-members, yet I was not so simple when I was in my Place, to think that all the people that dwelt within the bounds of the Parish where I was Minister, must own me for their Minister; as if a spot of ground measured out by a Civil constitution,

must

must make a man a member of a Church, which *as such* is a *spiritual and free society*. I wish Dr. *Goodman* could convince all the *Papists* that dwell within these Parishes, that therefore they are members of the Church of *England*, or *Schismaticks*.

3. I know nothing but *consent* that constitutes any man a member of a Church; but that we never gave either to the Priests imposed upon us by a Patron, and a Prelate; nor to the *Parochial* Church, as you take Parochial.

Wherefore upon Dr. *Goodman*'s definition I argue, where there was no union, there can be no Schism.

But between us and your Church there was no union: *Ergo*, no Schism; why then doth he charge us with it?

3ly. Suppose we were members, yet still you are to prove there was no *cause given* for our separation; which though you attempt to do, yet Sir, you must bring other manner of arguments than Rhetorical flourishes, and humane stories to convince us.

But one thing more: Why doth he tye up his definition to a *particular Church*? I think a man may hold Communion with that particular Church of which he is a member, and yet both he and that *particular Church* too, may be guilty of *Schism*. So that his definition is too strait. I will give him more advantage, and let him take it.

I shall then give a description of Schism, and open it. Then I will lay down several Propositions tending to the clearing of the Question, who are the *true Schismaticks*.

Schism *is a renting or dissolving that Union which Christ our Head requireth in his visible body*.

To open it, I shall be short.

1st. That Christ hath a Body *Natural* and *Mystical*, or a body in a mystery, which is to him as his natural body, is known to all Christians, *Ephes* 1. 22. speaking of Christ, *He is the head over all to the Church*, v. 23. *which is his body*. This Head, and this Body, make up one Christ *mystical*, 1 Cor. 12. 12. so is Christ.

2ly. This Body of Christ is but *one*; two Bodies joined to one Head, much more thousands, were monstrous. All the believers in all the particular Churches of the world make up but this *one* Body of Christ, ἓν σῶμα, *Ehes*. 4. 4. *one body*. So *Rom*. 12. 4, 5. & 1 *Cor*. 12. 12. so *Revel*. 19. & *ch*. 21. *one Bride, one Wife*.

3ly. This body hath its bands or ligaments, whereby the body is tyed to the Head, and the members one to another. For those to the *Head* I omit; the other concern me in this place, how the members are tyed one to another. Now these ligaments are first *Internal*; secondly, are *External*.

1. *Inter-*

1. *Internal*: and they, 1. The bleſſed *Spirit* of Chriſt, *Epheſ.* 4. 4. *One body and one ſpirit.* ſo 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. The ſecond is *love*, *Col.* 3. 14. *Eph.* 5. 16.

2. The *External* bands are the Sacraments or Seals of the New Covenant; whether *Government* be any thing, I ſhall touch afterwards.

But for the *Sacraments*, they are the bands of this *viſible body*; they belong *only* to the members of this body; *one Baptiſm*, Epheſ. 4. 5. belong only to that *one body*, v. 4.

1 Cor. 11. 17. *We being many, are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread.*

Hence *Excommunication*, in which men are cut off the Body, and rendered, *durante hoc ſtatu*, as Heathens and Publicans, not viſible members of Chriſt, is by caſting them out of Communion with their Body in theſe Ordinances. In theſe Ordinances the viſible members of the body declare that unity and internal band of love one to another.

Panis igitur fractio eſt unitatis, & dilectionis ſymbolum. Paræus *in loc.* who quotes *Chryſoſtom*, and the practiſe of the old Chriſtian Churches, how Chriſtians in this Ordinance did manifeſt their *unity* and *love*.

Virtute hujus Sacramenti, coalescimus, in unum corpus invicem & cum Chriſto. Par. *in loc.*

A Chriſtians love (I ſpeak to the buſineſs in hand) is twofold.

1. There is a Chriſtian love *common to all*,

2. There is a Chriſtian Eccleſiaſtical love *proper to ſome*; as for *Chriſtian love* I am bound to manifeſt that to the bodies and ſouls of *all*, though Heathens. I will pray with Heathens, (a ſilly thing to turn Excommunicated perſons from *Prayer*, which is *Natural Worſhip*) I will Preach to Heathens; I will exhort, reprove, encourage Heathens privately; to comfort a Heathen as a Chriſtian, I cannot; elſe I call not to mind what effects of love I manifeſt to a Chriſtian, but I will to a Heathen.

But for *Chriſtian Eccleſiaſtical love*, manifeſted by Communion in theſe Symbols or ſigns, I will not manifeſt that to *one* Heathen, only to the members of this viſible body, being one with them.

As for *Epiſcopal Government*, which Dr. *Goodman*, and this late Commencer adds,

Firſt, I would thank either of them if they would give us a ſtout piece againſt *Eraſtus* and his followers.

2*ly*. If by *Epiſcopal* Government they *mean ſuch* as now is among us, let them firſt prove it is of *Divine Inſtitution*, which all the Commencers in *Cambridg* or *Oxford* ſhall never be able to do, ſo long as there is a Bible; and if they cannot do that, then where is the *ſchiſm*? It's rather our duty to ſeparate from what is not of Chriſts planting in his houſe.

3*ly*. But

3*ly*. But let the Government be of Christs Institution, yet wherein doth that Government shew it self? among other things in letting in, or casting out of this body? by admitting or casting out from these Ordinances of the Sacraments? but that refusing, or separation from *such* Episcopal-Government, meerly as *Episcopal*, should be *Mortale schisma*, this is but the figment of the delirant-brain of a Prelatical Zealot.

2*ly*. This Schism is in the *visible body* of Christ. *I hear there are schisms among you*, 1 Cor. 11. 8. the *house of Chloe*, 1 Cor. 1. 11. *saw* them, who informed *Paul*. Schism it seems comes under the senses, then it must be in the *visible body*, when this body visibly met together.

By the *visible body* of Christ I understand all that make profession of their Faith in the Lord Jesus, and the Doctrine of the Gospel soundly, and do in their conversation visibly walk according to his Rules in his Gospel, so that their conversation do not openly belie and deny their profession, *Tit.* 1. 16.

That the *one* body of Christ mentioned 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. in which there ought to *be no schism*, v. 25. is meant the *visible* body of Christ, I think none will deny. So *Rom.* 12. *& Ephes.* 4.

1. It is such a body in which the Lord had *set Apostles, Evangelists*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 18. *Ephes.* 4. 11. such a body to which extraordinary gifts were given. But these were Apostles; not to one *particular* Church, but the Catholick Church visible.

2. *One member is to suffer or rejoice with another*, 1 Cor. 12. 26. Ay, if it be a member and real member of our particular Church of *Corinth*; but for other Churches, and unless we are sure they are invisible members, let them go. Is this the meaning?

3. Are we baptized into a particular, or the Catholick Church? 1 *Cor.* 12. 13. and Baptism belongs to the visible Church.

Other things I might mention, but I think it will not be denied.

3*ly*. When then that *union* our Lord and Head requireth in this his visible body is rent, dissolved; when Communion is denied among the members of it, contrary to his appointment.

Now *Schism* appears, when the internal band, *Love*, is broken, there is something of the nature, the root of the sin is in it, but that is hid. Men can hypocritically and vilely meet together, and hold communion in that Ordinance which holds forth unity and love, and have their hearts wretchedly divided one from another, this may be hid, as I said.

But *Schism* properly so called, is when the *external band* is broken; when communion in those symbols or signs, is denied on one side, or refused on the other side, without warrant from Christ; so that the members

members do not meet and hold their communion as they ought, but ſplit into ſeveral pieces, oppoſite one to another, as if they were not members of that *one body*. Now *Schiſm* is apparent, *Quia hæc ſciſſio maximè perficitur & apparet in debita communione Eccleſiaſtica recuſanda, id circo illa ſeparatio, per appropriationem ſingularem vocato vocatur*, Schiſma. *Ames Conſc.*

Having opened our deſcription for finding out the *true Schiſmatical Church or Perſons*, let me give the Reader my mind under ſeveral Propoſitions.

Firſt, I reaſſume that which I mentioned before, *viz.* the body of Chriſt is but *one*; and that Schiſm is found in the *viſible* body.

2*ly*. This body being but *one*, hence then, that this one body comes to be divided into ſo many particular Churches, and meeting in ſo many particular places to celebrate the Sacrament, and the other Inſtitutions of Chriſt, it is is but accidental, and not eſſential to this body, it being the conſequent of that vaſt number which makes up this *one* body.

3*ly*. Such yet ought to be the Conformity of all theſe particular Churches unto the Goſpel pattern, the Law and Rule of their *Head*, in their *Faith and Doctrine, in their Worſhip and Diſcipline, in their converſation and practiſe*, I may add, and *conſtitutions*, that whereever the members of this body come, they may manifeſt their *Unity*, and *Chriſtian Eccleſiaſtical love* to and with thoſe particular Churches, without any juſt ſcruple or doubt. It being not in the power of any particular Church to vary in the leaſt from that Rule and Pattern their Lord and Head hath given them; for in ſo doing they deny him to be the Head, and make themſelves the *Head*. The Head is to direct.

4*ly*. If any particular Church ſhall vary from that Pattern, and ſhall *impoſe* upon the members of this body, *conditions of communion* which our Head hath not impoſed, and ſuch as from the light of Scripture we cannot but apprehend as ſinful, and yet will force them to ſubject to ſuch conditions, or elſe no communion; that *impoſing Church is the ſchiſmatical Church*, and the guilt of *Schiſm* lyes at their door; Let this Impoſition be in *Faith*, *Worſhip*, *Diſcipline*, or *Manners*. Let the Church be Papal (if that be a Church), *Epiſcopal*, *Presbyterian*, *Independent*, *Anabaptiſtical*, *Lutheran*, *Calviniſt*, no matter what, the *Impoſing party* is the Schiſmatick. Why do you, how dare you if you be members of that Head, impoſe that upon the members of his Body, which himſelf hath not? we will not, we muſt not admit any other *wiſdom* or *will* in things which concern him, but his own; if we may admit *three* things which vary from his Rule, we may admit three

hundred, and turn him out from being *Head*. A great ſtir there is about the power of the Church in *circumſtances* of worſhip: If you mean *inſeparable* circumſtances, ordering them according to the general Rule our Head hath given, for the *edification* of the Church, I know no Nonconformiſt ſuch a block as to deny it; but that the things impoſed upon us as conditions of Communion in the Church of *England* (as you call it) are ſuch, the former diſcourſe hath ſufficiently proved the contrary. Hence the Church-men of *England* are the Schiſmaticks.

5*ly*. It is an irrational thing that the *Impoſers of Conditions* in things belonging to God, ſhould be the *ſole Judges* of the lawfulneſs of their *Impoſitions*.

Firſt, Becauſe there is but *one word or Rule* given, to which the *Impoſers* and *Impoſed* are ſtrictly bound, and the Impoſed may underſtand that Rule as well and better than the Impoſers; elſe how the Proteſtant party will defend themſelves againſt *Rome* (the Impoſer) I know not; they ſuppoſe they underſtood it better than *Rome*, and ſo do you now think.

2*ly*. The Impoſers have *ſin* in them, and may ſin; they are not *Infallible*; therefore their Impoſitions muſt be judged by others.

3*ly*. If Impoſers muſt be *ſole Judges*, and we muſt obey becauſe they impoſe, then never muſt *the people of God obey the call to come out of Babylon*, Apoc. 18. 4. for Impoſing-*Babylon*, being the ſole Judg, will tell you, her Impoſitions are all lawful, and therefore you muſt obey.

6*ly*. Chriſt our Head no where requires, but rather forbids our holding Communion with that Church which Impoſeth ſuch things as conditions of Communion, which his members cannot ſubſcribe to, but with a *doubtful conſcience*, Rom. 14 23. πᾶν δὲ ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἁμάρτια ἐστίν. *He that doubteth is damned if he eat*; but not, if becauſe of doubting he dare not eat.

That there are ſome ſuch giddy Chriſtians who will find ſuch exceptions againſt any Church that they cannot communicate with a clear conſcience, though there be no humane invention impoſed, but only what Chriſt himſelf hath appointed, I do not deny; but then let the guilt of Schiſm lye at their door. But as to your *Humane Injunctions* we cannot ſubmit to them, but with a *doubtful conſcience* at leaſt.

7*ly*. There is great difference between a Church in which there are ſome corruptions, but no *Impoſition*, and a Church where there is impoſition of Humane Inventions, not *agreeable* to the Word; with the firſt we would not doubt to communicate, but not with the ſecond.

Hence for the examples brought againſt us out of the Scripture, where were corrupt Churches, but no command for ſeparation, as under the Old Teſtament.

It's

It's very true, how could they make a ſeparation there from the *Temple*, and the *Levitical Prieſthood*, without going expreſly againſt the Word? Might they erect another Temple? Is there any ſuch *Temple* under the Goſpel?

For thoſe in the New Teſtament:

1*ſt*. Their Churches were rightly conſtituted.

2*ly*. Their Paſtors were rightly called.

3*ly*. Their Paſtors ſound in Doctrine; we do not read they were charged with unſoundneſs.

4*ly*. For outward ſcandalous ſins we read of none in their Paſtors.

5*ly*. Their members for the major part ſound; though ſome particular members were unſound in Doctrine and converſation, yet they were but few.

6*ly*. They had Chriſts Order and Diſcipline, as he appointed, to help themſelves againſt thoſe unſound and corrupt members.

Hence what cauſe was here for ſeparation? what underſtanding man would ſcruple communion with theſe Churches, though there were ſome corruptions? Compare yours and theſe. But,

1*ſt*. Where was this *Impoſition* of Humane Inventions in the Worſhip of God? unleſs ſome few Schiſmaticks in the Church of *Corinth*, we do not find the Churches charged with mixing any thing of *theirs* in the Worſhip of God.

2*ly*. Which of thoſe Churches had ſworn to the Great God to reform what was amiſs in *Doctrine*, *Worſhip*, and *Diſcipline*, and then return to their vomit again?

8*ly*. Chriſt our Head may hold communion with his members living in corrupt Impoſing Churches, and yet others of his members that ſee and know theſe corruptions, muſt not hold communion with them; ſtill the Schiſm lyes upon the Impoſer.

1*ſt*. Your Spiritual Courts having Excommunicated many gracious and ſincere-hearted Chriſtians, for what cauſe we know; a ſad thing that ſuch a ſolemn Ordinance ſhould be ſo abuſed. But with theſe gracious Chriſtians, Chriſt holds communion we are ſure; and will not your Church therefore hold Communion with them?

2*ly*. Chriſt holds Communion with his people in *Babylon*, Apoc. 18.4. how were they made, and kept his people elſe? muſt we therefore hold Communion with *Babylon*?

3*ly*. Chriſt holds Communion with his people in the *Lutheran* Churches, I doubt not; but if they impoſe upon you the Doctrine of the Ubiquity of Chriſts Humane Nature as a condition of Communion, will you hold Communion with them?

9*ly*. Perſecution joined to Impoſition upon the members of Chriſts

body, what Christ never imposed, renders the sin of the Imposing Church much greater; and refusing Communion with such a Persecuting Imposing Church is no *Schism*. If Christ doth give us leave to flee from one Persecuting City to another, where there is no Persecution, then if a City be a Persecuting City, by reason of a Persecuting Church, surely he doth not bind us to hold Communion with that Persecuting Church.

10*ly*. Though one particular Church cannot communicate with another particular Church, because of their corrupt Impositions, yet if that Church which cannot communicate with the other, will admit of those members of that Church who walk as become Christians in all other points, excepting those Imposed corruptions which at present they cannot see, being blinded with those deluding notions of *indifferency* and *circumstances*, that Church cannot be charged with *Schism*, though they refuse communion with the *Imposing* Church; for we give communion to their members, only exclude their imposed corruptions. I do not mean such members as voluntarily took that solemn Oath, &c. of reforming those corruptions, and now return to them again. I look on this as a greater sin; but for others I know several of our Churches would give them communion, (I do not say *all* will) but then how are we Schismaticks?

11*ly*. Particular Churches may be so corrupt both in Doctrine, Worship, and Conversation, that the sounder members not only *may*, but *ought* to separate from them to save their own souls from infection, and this is not *Schism* but *Duty*.

12*ly*. The case of those who are actual members of those Churches where these corruptions are, is different from those who are no members of such Churches; they have something else to do before they may separate.

13*ly*. If it be our sin to communicate with such as we know to be notoriously wicked, unless we follow the rule of Christ, *Mat.* 18. 15, 16, &c. to seek the removal of them, or do not our duty to reform the Pastor, or remove him, as Mr. *Baxter* tells us; How we shall communicate without sin, though we had nothing else to trouble us, I know not: that many such come to the Sacraments, and who more boldly than they? we know; which way shall we reform them? the Curate hath no Juridical power. To the Spiritual Court must we go? To the Diocesan must we go? we are like to mend it; carry Witnesses, how many miles? when yet the power we cannot own to be of Christ. When all is done, have a Writ upon our backs to bring us to the common Law, and what then?

Cure of Church-Division, *pag.* 100.

Whence to conclude, they have dealt unworthily by us, who bring the

the old *Nonconformists* against us, to condemn us, as if the state of *this* Church were the same with the true Church of *England*.

POSTSCRIPT.

AFTER I had finished, I met with a Pamphlet, Entituled, *The reason of Episcopal Inspection asserted, in a Sermon at a Visitation in* Cambridg, *by* John Templer, *D. D.*

The scope of the Sermon is to prove the *Divine Right of Prelacy over Elders and Congregations*. And that the Author might shew himself to be a true Son of the Church, he hath given sufficient proof in every particular. For the *Liturgy*, that is so perfect, that he saith, *the most accuminated Intellect is not able with justice to charge it with any error*, p. 18. All then the old Nonconformists, *Parker*, *Ames*, *Bradshaw*, *Cartwright*, *Richardson*, *Dideclavius*, &c. together with the latter Nonconformists, who were appointed with others by the Kings command, to review the Liturgy, and have given an account what things in it were to be corrected; *Calvin* also, for saying he found in it some *Tolerabiles Ineptiæ*, are all by this *accuminated* Doctor, dub'd for so many Dunces. They must be men of higher *Acumens* than these, that can find any just cause against it; these have said nothing considerable. But whatever be the opinion of this Author, yet Mr. *Jeanes*, a man of an acute Intellect, one of their own, and as great a Zealot once as he can be, confesseth when he intended to write in defence of the Discipline and Ceremonies, when he read these mens Books, he found such arguments in them as were never answered, and thereupon layed by his Pen, his judgment being quickly altered; but if you be a person of a more *accuminated Intellect*, why did you not answer those *dull* fellows, and therein do us a kindness, that we might have conformed as well as you?

He tells the Reader, p. 17. *If this order* (of Prelacy) *had a period, the Dissenters would never pitch upon any one way.*

A. 1. The same saith the old Gentleman at *Rome*, these Dissenting Protestants cannot pitch upon one way. Hence no period must be put to the *Papal Government*.

2*ly*. You were very cunning, Sir, to pitch upon the warm side of the hedg, thereby to save your selves from persecution, and keep your fat Livings; then cry up obedience to Governours; pity the

Ma[illegible]

Martyrs had no better Intellects to have taken this course too, and so have saved their stakes!

3. If men would lay by their self-interests, we might sooner pitch upon *one* way; but so long as *he sits* at *Rome*, and the *Jews* are uncalled, I look but for little of this unity in the Gentile-Churches.

But to the main scope of his Sermon: Had it been to prove the Divine Right of an *Episcopus Præses* (or *Primus Presbyter*, as *Ambrose* calls a Bishop) *with* the Presbytery or Ecclesiastical Senate, I should not have been his opposer; but it is an *Episcopus Princeps*, and that not *with*, but *over* the Presbytery, *superiour in power*, which he contends for; how strongly proved, we shall see.

His Text was, *Act.* 15. 36. *Paul said to Barnabas, Let us go again, and visit our Brethren*, &c.

That the *Doctor* intended out of this Text to prove *such a Visitation* as was then when he Preached, and so in *England* when Bishops visit, I presume; else he deceived *him* to whom he dedicates it, and the four Doctors that Licensed it. See how the Text will force it.

The Proposition or Antecedent is this: *Paul* and *Barnabas*, two Apostles, *Act.* 14. 14. *Persons of extraordinary mission, commission, and qualifications* for the office, having by their Preaching converted many people from Heathenism to the Faith of Christ, gathered them into Churches, and set Elders over them. These Elders and Churches being but all young Converts, and through the relicts of corruption in them, and the malice of Satan and his Emissaries without them, being in danger to miscarry in Doctrine or manners, these *two Apostles* go to visit the Churches, which they had planted.

Therefore *one Prelate* but of *ordinary mission, commission and qualification*, that never converted one *Church*, (may be not *one person* in truth), shall have power over many Elders and Congregations where he never Preached; over so many, that if he Preached every Lords-day, he could not preach once in a year to them; yea so many, that if he Preached every day in the year, he could not preach once in a year to them, (some Dioceses are so large.) This consequent from such an Antecedent, my dull Intellect cannot reach. I deny the Consequence.

What might be said, I foresee, and would have prevented it, but I am in a *Postscript*, and so can only touch things as I pass.

Arguments he fetches from three Topicks, to prove the *superiority* of one single person over other Elders.

1. From *Reason*, p. 23. *Though the Universal Church be built upon a Rock, yet particular Churches are subject to Dilapidations*, &c. Ergo.

A. In matters belonging to the House of God, I thought the *will*

of

of him that built the House, and is Lord over it, should first have been consulted: If in *will* hath *reason* in it, we are sure; but for *our reasons*, they will put no end to the debate, for one thinks his reason is as good as another, *Quot capita, tot sententiæ*. It is *Institution* worship we are upon, depending upon the positive command of the Law giver. But however I deny your consequence: And that,

1*st*. From the woful experience the Church hath found of your *Repairers*; these having been as great causes of the *Dilapidations*, as any other. That Bishops have been both great Schismaticks and Hereticks, *Bellarmine* will tell you. What woful work these have made in the Church of *England* in our time, we do still remember; but I will spare names, let them alone in their graves. *Musculus* (not an *English* Nonconformist) from the experience the Church had found of the mischiefs it suffered by these *Repairers*, found out to prevent and heal *Schism*, as *Hierom* tells us, saith, *Had* Hierom *lived to these days to see how this counsel of setting up the Bishop above the Presbyter hath profited the Church, he would have acknowledged it was not the counsel of the Holy Ghost to take away Schism, as was pretended, but the counsel of the Devil, &c.* Thus he, with much more he adds. *Mr. Baxter* Church-History. gives sufficient proof. *Musc.* loc. Commun. p. 195.

2*ly*. There are other means to repair, without such Prelacy, as experience hath proved in several Churches, where Heresie and Schism have either been kept out, or healed when crept in; Profaneness suppressed better than ever it was in *England* by Prelacy.

3*ly*. That one Prelate is as subject to corruption in Doctrine, and conversation, as other Ministers; and who shall repair him? the Presbyters being inferior to him, they must not be so sawcy; that kind of Creature whom you call the Metropolitan, is as subject to corruption, as the other Prelate.

As to the proof you give, p. 26, 27. *There is a greater probability of an union of judgments, when all within a certain precinct lye under an obligation to be determined by the reason of one*, &c.

A. I thank you for this, saith the new Pope *Innocent*; this helps to strengthen my old worm-eaten Chair, weak in the joints, and ready to crack. Heresie and Schism must be avoided in the *Universal Church*, as well as in the Church in your *Precinct*; but if the Bishops in your several Precincts differ in their Judgments about Heresie and Schism as they have done, and will do, now what *more probable way for union of Judgments, than to have them lye under an obligation to be determined by the reason of one*; and who should that *one* be, but my self? this is but the same reason that *Bellarmine* hath given for *Pontifex Maximus*.

2*ly*. In one Diocess are some hundreds of Elders, all having the power of Jurisdiction *ex æquo* from Christ, as the Learned Dr. *Stil-*

Lingſters hath proved; but however, if this Doctor deny it, among theſe there may be many as godly men, of as ſolid reaſon and judgment, as is this *one Prelate*, yea it may be excel him in all, and in years his Elder too; yet all theſe muſt have their reaſons and judgments ſubject to the determination of the reaſon of that *one Prelate*. I ſhall not applaud him for a man of an *accuminated Intellect*, that ſhall aſſert ſuch an irrational Propoſition.

2. His ſecond Topick *is Gods Declaration for the perpetuity of Apoſtolical Government*, which was over other Elders and Congregations, *p.* 28. Yea, Sir, this is of moment, if you can carry it.

Firſt Text, *Mat.* 28. 20. *Teach, baptize, inſtruct all Nations to obſerve whatſoever was commanded them* I pray add this, *And he commanded them to teach That one Prelate, while the Church ſtands, ſhould have ſuperior power over other Elders and Congregations*, then you do ſomething.

Becauſe you mention *commands* for Government, name two or three Texts to ſtop the mouths of theſe *Eraſtians*.

But to the Text. It is not for nothing that our Lord while he mentions *Teaching*, *Baptizing*, and under this the Lords Supper; yet ſaith nothing of *Government*. Surely he had a reaſon for it.

2. I yield from the Apoſtles and other Elders, Government recorded in the Scripture, that Government belongs to the Elderſhip (with the *Eraſtians* leave) but from hence to infer that becauſe the Apoſtles did exerciſe power over other Elders, *Ergo*, now one Prelate over other Elders: I ſhall deny the Conſequence.

For, 1. you tell us, *p.* 25. *It's true the Unction whereby they were qualified for it, was not of the vulgar compoſition.*

But ſay I, the Unction theſe Prelates have, is but of the *vulgar compoſition*. Hence to argue from *extraordinary* to *ordinary*, is a kind of fallacy, a-kin to *μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος*.

They that exerciſe Government over other Governours (as all Elders are) had need be in Wiſdom, Learning, Holineſs, and fitneſs for Government, as *Saul* among his brethren, higher by head and ſhoulders; ſo were the Apoſtles and Evangeliſts above thoſe Elders over whom they exerciſed Authority. We find no ſuch things amongſt the men of the *vulgar Unction*.

2. Thoſe *Elders*, as well as the people, were the Apoſtles (*converts*): theſe being but newly brought home to the Faith, well may their *Fathers* have power over them, and cauſe enough to viſit them; the caſe is not ſo here.

3*ly*. When the Apoſtles come to deal with the ordinary Elders, there is no intimation left of any ſuch power of one Prelate over the reſt. You tell us *p.* 45. that *Timothy* was Ordained Biſhop of *Epheſus*

about the 13th. year of *Claudius*. I hope you will not force it from 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. *As I beſought thee to abide ſtill at* Epheſus. He muſt have an illuminated Intellect indeed, who can force the ordination of a Biſhop out of theſe words. Beſides, certainly had he been Biſhop there, *Paul* need not have *beſought* him to be *reſident* there; but however ſure I am, he muſt be ordained before *Pauls* journey to *Jeruſalem*, Acts 20. for he tells *Timothy*, 1 Tim. 3. 14. *he hoped to come unto him ſhortly*, but *Act.* 20. 25. when he ſent for the Elders of *Epheſus*, he tells them *they ſhall ſee his face no more*. If *Timothy* then were Biſhop of *Epheſus* before this time, then he was there now, and was now ſent for, which I ſhall never believe, that *Paul* would not mention him in particular, whoſe Name he uſes to joyn with his in ſeveral Epiſtles. But if *Timothy* did come with the other Elders, here is no difference made of this Prelate from the other Elders, but 28. *ver.* he gives the ſame alike to them all. Therefore I deny your Conſequence. If *Timothy* were Biſhop of *Epheſus*, what need *Paul* tell him, in his ſecond *Epiſtle to him*, Chap. 4. 12. *Tychicus I have ſent to Epheſus?* he might have ſpared that line, for *Timothy* muſt needs know it, if he came to him there.

But you add, for a further Confirmation, p. 28. the words of Chriſt, *Joh.* 20. 21. *As my Father ſent me, ſo I ſend you.* But *the Commiſſion of Chriſt as an Apoſtle, did undoubtedly extend to a ſuperintendency over the Clergy, and the particle* sicut *will juſtifie the ſame, as to the Apoſtles*, &c.

A. Undoubtedly Chriſts Commiſſion did extend as you ſay, without limiting it to any *precincts*, which you tell us ſeveral times the Apoſtles were, and eſpecially in *p.* 6. you would labour to prove it from 2 *Cor.* 10. 16. [Though that Text I conceive will not do it.] But if the particle *ſicut*, will force their ſuperintendency over the Clergy, it will as well force it, without limitation to ſuch *precincts*, for his Father did not *ſo* ſend him, and how their Commiſſion runs, we read. But I ſhall not give my thoughts about this now; you tell us, *pag.* 34. *that among the Biſhops, Peter leads the Van in the Church of* Antioch. [Pope *Innocent*, this does not make for you: I pray tell us in your next, in which Church did *Paul* lead the Van among the Biſhops.] But if *Peter* were Biſhop at *Antioch*, indeed *Paul* went beyond his Precincts, when he dealt ſo roundly with a Biſhop in his own See, as he did with this Biſhop of *Antioch*, Gal. 2. 11. 14.

2*ly*. I conceive you ſtretch this Text beyond the intent of our Lord. For the work which our Lord undertook, he had a Call from his Father, who ſent him, *Heb.* 5. 4. *Joh.* 6. 27. and 10. 36. His Father had Authority to ſend him, and was with him, *Joh.* 16. 32. So he the Head and King of his Church, *having all power given to him in Hea-*

ven and in Earth, Matth. 28. 18. had Authority to send forth his Apostles to their work; they might show their Commissions, or Credentials. He promised also to be with them and their Successors to the end: and I think all Gospel-Ministers are their Successors: but that the Lord intended in these words the setling of a Superiority of one person above his brethren in the Ministry to the end of the world this is but *Petitio principii*, your glos, and I deny it, for the Reasons and Scriptures before mentioned.

3*ly*. Those Apostles had Superiority over Bishops, if there were such then, as you say there were, yea, Arch-Bishops; who is now over them?

His third Text is *Eph* 4. 12, 13. *Apostles were given and their Suffragans* [as you call them] *Prophets and Evangelists, for the perfecting of the Saints*, hence *pag.* 30. you conclude, for the duration of Prophets and Evangelists to this day.

Thus then we have to this day *Apostles, Prophets*, and *Evangelists*, in the sense of this Text [unless he will abuse the Text:] a rare sight: I would go many miles to see such persons; and to their Superiority willingly submit.

Calvin, Gerhard, Beza, Zanchi, the Leyden Professors, &c. tell us these were *Ministri extraordinarii & Temporarii*; but they were men of no *Acuminated Intellects*, their judgements signifie little.

Well Sir, what Apostles were, you tell us not, neither need you, we know them well: but where you can find such, I know not: but such you must find, if your proof hold.

For the *Prophets* you tell us, *they were such as had an excellent skill to preach the Gospel out of the Books of the Old Testament*, 1 Cor. 13. 2. *Evangelical Doctrines locked up in the Figures of the Law, and Predictions of the Prophets.*

If this were all, we shall find many such Prophets amongst the Nonconformists. But, Sir, you have spoken very short of the Prophets; *Dr. Hammond, Zanchy*, and *Gerhard*, add two things more.

1. *A foretelling things to come.* 2*ly*. *They spake all from the Spirit*, from a Divine Afflatus. These three are somewhat like, I pray shew us these Prophets now.

The *Evangelists* you tell us, are such *as had a profound insight into the Gospel, as contained in the Writings of the New-Testament: and could with singular dexterity open and explain its true importance.*

Such there are also amongst the Nonconformists.

But Sir, what if there were Evangelists, before there was any part of the New-Testament *written*? how then does your description agree?

I question not, if the Ancients say true of the time when *John* wrote

his

his Gospel, but *Timothy* was an Evangelist long before: and in that Gospel are the deep Mysteries contained, more than in the other three. If the first Epistle to the *Thessalonians*, were the first Epistle that *Paul* wrote, as Divines generally think, *Timothy* is joyned with *Paul* in the 1. *ver.* so that very little was written when he first was made an Evangelist; I see by some of your own, and those Learned men, *Philip* was an *Evangelist* when he preached the Gospel at *Samaria*, and wrought Miracles, *Acts* 8.5,6,7. but at that time no part of the New Testament was written. For *Matthew* wrote first, and that was eight years after the Ascension as our Divines for the generality of them agree.

But for the *Evangelists*, *Eusebius*, l.3. *Chap.*37. a fitter man to tell us what an *Evangelist* was, than you, gives us another description, and that which agrees with *Philip* in *Acts* 8.5,6,7. and other Scriptures; I shall note only these.

1. *That they watered the Churches, every where planted by the Apostles.*

2. *They preached Christ to them, which as yet heard not of the Doctrine of Christ.*

3. *Having planted the Faith in new and strange places, they ordained there other Pastors, committing to them the Tillage of the new ground, pressing themselves to other People and Countries.*

4. *By the power of the Holy Ghost they wrought miraculously.*

Show us these *Evangelists* now.

His last Text is, 1 Tim.6.14. *Keep the Commandments until the appearing of the Lord Jesus*, &c.

A. 1. By the *appearing* of the Lord, *&c. exitus vitæ* is meant, thinks *Austin*, and some others. But if not, yet this *appearing* is an Argument used not only to *Timothy*, but to all Christians, to look to their duty, *Col.*3.4 *Tit.*2.13. 1. *Pet.*1.7.

2. What *Commandment* this was, if we well observe the 11. and 13. *ver.* going before, we may well guess.

3. If you refer it to his *Office* as you do, and would thence infer the perpetuity of his *Office* to the Worlds end; I deny that to be the meaning.

For, when the Apostle charges him, 2 *Tim.*4.5. *do the work of an Evangelist*, &c. there the word *Evangelist* is taken in the same sense with *Eph.*4 11. not only *Calvin*, and *Gerhard*, but *Scultetus*, though an Episcopal man, yieldeth, and it were absurd to think otherwise.

But that *Timothy* in the 1. *Epistle Chap.* 1. 3. should be ordained a Bishop as you say, and long after this charged to do the work of an *Evangelist*, they must have *dull Intellects* indeed, that know nothing of an *Evangelist*, and a Bishop who believe it: The *Evangelist* being one

fixed to no place, and had the power of Miracles, as *Eusebius* and the Scriptures testifie.

This was a Commandment so incumbent upon *Timothy*, that his Salvation or miscarrying was concerned in it, as he performed it, and so it is true of all Ministers; but for an *Evangelist*, the *French Church*, the *Low-Countries*, *Scotland*, *New-England*, [where Mr. *Eliot* hath more right of Superiority over the Churches of the Indians, than any Prelate in the World, yet would detest your Doctrine] nor any Churches that I know of, own an *Evangelist*.

As yet then the proof fails. Thus we find in *Clemens Epistle* to the *Corinthians*, a *Metropolitan Church* (forsooth) there is no mention made of any such Prelate. But *pag.* 2, 62, 69. and 73. especially, he mentions only *Elders* without any distinction. A Bishop being but *Primus Presbyter*, as *Ambrose* calls him, it may stand with *Episcopus Praeses*. Thus *Polycarpus* in his Epistle to the Church in *Philippi*, another *Metropolis*, saith *Dr. Hammond*; there is no menion of any such *Prelate*, but *pag.* 18. he exhorts them to be subject to the *Elders* and *Deacons*, answering to *Paul*, *Phil.* 1. 1.

Primi Presbyteri, Episcopi, appellabantur. Ambros. in 4 Eph.

For *Timothy's being twice ordained*, and Δια προφητειας, mentioned 1 *Tim.* 4. 14 which you would have understood of Prophets, *&c p.* 45, 46.

What you aim at, in *Timothy's* twice Ordination, I know not; whether that *one* may be twice ordained, though first by Presbyters: let it first be proved that *Timothy* was twice ordained to the *same* Office. *Timothy first ordained by the Apostle himself, you say*, 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. I pray Sir to what Office? say, and prove from Divine Writ.

If the second time ordained, not to an inferiour Office I hope; the first Ordination by an Apostle, the second to a higher Office by Inferiour Officers. I pray when was he ordained an *Evangelist*?

Nor does your notion of Δια προφητειας, take, to be meant of any other *Prophets* different from *Paul*; for we know that *Paul* excelled in *all gifts*, 1 Cor. 14, 18. as of *Tongues*, so no question of *Prophesie*. Why therefore *Paul* might not be *He* to whom the Spirit revealed this concerning *Timothy*, as yet so young, and so to take him along for his Companion, give us a Reason, for it seems there was a χαρισμα given, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. Δια προφητειας, and in 2 *Tim.* 1. 6 he bids him stir up the χαρισμα, which was in him, δια της επιθεσεως των χειρων. That the Apostles did convey *gifts* we know, by their imposing of hands; though the *Presbytery* joyned with the Apostle in his *Ordination*; and so I know not above *One* Ordination that ever *Timothy* had, and that to an *Evangelist*.

His third and last Topick to prove the Superiority of this Prelate is, *the practise of the universal Church*, pag. 42. To which add his saying, *pag.* 93. *As for Prelacy*; [*the Essence whereof lyes in a Superiority of an*

Ecclesiastical

Eccleſiaſtical perſon over Elders in a certain precinct] *it was ever owned by the Church as agreeable to the Canon of Scripture.*

Sir, did you deliver this in the Pulpit, for a Truth, where be ſure no man ought to ſpeak any thing but Truth?

Have not you read *Auſtins* Epiſtle to *Hierom*, *Epiſtle* 18. in which *Auſtin* writes thus to him, *Quanquam enim ſecundum honorum Vocabula quæ jam* Eccleſiæ uſus *obtinuit, Epiſcopatus Presbyterio major eſt*, &c. Surely you have read *Hieroms* Comment upon *Tit.* 1. *Epiſcopi noverint ſe magis* conſuetudine, *quam* Diſpoſitionis Dominicæ *veritate Presbyteris eſſe majores.* To which A. B. *Anſelm* ſubſcribes, in his Comment on the ſame Chapter. What Sir, is *Eccleſiæ uſus* and *Conſuetudo*, the ſame with *Canon of Scripture*?

Have not you read *Eſtius*, *Sent.* l. 4. d. 24. calling thoſe Hereticks that are not of your Opinion, and undertaking to prove the *jus Divinum* of Prelacy as you do? he ſaith thus. *Quod autem* jure Divino *ſint Epiſcopi Presbyteris Superiores*; & ſi non ita clarum eſt e ſacris Scripturis, *aliunde tamen ſatis efficaciter probari poteſt.* Have you not read what *Medina* ſaith of the *Fathers* in this point; and what our Biſhop *Jewel*, naming the ſame Fathers that *Medina* did, adds, *Paul himſelf muſt be a Heretick, if Biſhop and Presbyter be not the ſame according to the Scriptures.* Much more I might add, that I wonder you could write ſuch a line.

And what Sir, will you exclude all thoſe Churches from being parts of the *Catholick Church*, that have not, nor do own your Prelacy? or what Church do you mean, when you ſay the *Church hath owned?*

That ſo many of the Church were of your Opinion, this with your *Metropolitan Arch-Biſhop* brought that Whore in *Apoc.* 17. to her Chair, without which that Prophecy had not been fulfilled to this day, ſo that though it is not true what you ſay, yet if it had been true, it had not much prevailed with me: but God hath left Teſtimony againſt it, both in his Word, and in the Church.

As for your notion, *p.* 51. *The reaſon why the Apoſtles wrote to the Churches that were in the cities which were Metropoles, was to ſhew that all the Churches which were in that Province did depend upon that Metropolis Government; and this Biſhop was an Archbiſhop*, p. 50.

I pray, Sir, which of the Apoſtles told you this was their reaſon? or where do you find this written?

The Apoſtle mentions but but one, Ἀρχιτελώνης, 1 *Pet.* 5. 4. This notion I ſee you are ſo taken with, that *p.* 51. you tell us, this Hypotheſis *gives the moſt intelligible account why all the Churches in* Aſia *are reduced to Seven.*

An *Intelligible account* then we have of *that*, which I had a deſire to

know; but because the Lord had hidden it, it became not me to inquire after his secrets; but now we have a reason why *all* the Churches in *Asia* are reduced to Seven.

1. I pray, Sir, give us (since you are so acquainted with Christs secrets) an *Intelligible account*, why, since there were so many Churches in *Europe*, and those Churches in the Metropoles, yet the Lord writes not to one of them in the *Apocalyps*, only to *Asia*? Was not *Rome* a Metropoles, and there a Church?

2*ly*. Are you sure these were all Metropoles? It seems there is some question about *Philadelphia*, and your solution does not satisfie. So for *Thyatira*, it seems *Pliny* doth not give it this honour, but *Ptolomy* doth. So that we must rest upon a *Humane Faith*, and prove which of these was the truest Writer.

3*ly*. But are you sure there were no more Churches in *Asia* than fell under the seven Archbishops? Which of these was Archbishop to the Churches in *Galatia*? that was a Province in *Asia*; but none of these Cities Metropolis there, for *Ancyra* was. *Antioch* a Metropolis then under none of these, yet there a Church. To which I pray did *Colosse* belong? *Cappadocia*, *Pontus*, *Bithinia*, were all Provinces in *Asia*, and in these were Churches no doubt, for the Apostle writing to the Believers in these Provinces, 1 *Pet.* 1. 1. in the 5*th* Chap. *v.* 1, 2. *He charges the Elders to feed the flock*. Yet none of the *seven* Churches were *Metropoles* in any of these Provinces. I could instance in divers more.

This I suppose the *Doctor* Preached to make amends for the fault he committed in being ordained first by Presbyters; for now he talks of Archbishops in the Apostles days; whereas Mr. *Thorndike*, *pag.* 45. *Prim. Gov.* and the old Episcopal men tell us, Archbishops came in long after.

As for your discourse from *p.* 60. to the end, in which you tell your Reader something concerning Rules about *Order*, *Decency*, *Circumstantials in Religion*. *Adiaphorus* matters, *&c.* and what the Church may do to preserve it self against opposers, that thereby *p.* 62. you might justifie the punishment inflicted upon us for our Nonconformity.

Sir, this is but the old Cheat to blind the people, as if we opposed *Order*, *Decency*, and *Circumstantials* in Religion; and for the punishment inflicted, will you justifie it that Governours may for every errour in things pertaining to God, punish their people for not conforming to them, as we are punished? but how much less then for nonconforming to *Humane Inventions* in the Worship of God? which as yet all the Pulpits and Presses have not proved to be our error, (I mean our *non conformity* to them) but our Duty.

And

And for that which p. 61. you would bring as a proof, *viz. That the Churches Determination upon ſome particulars, in conformity to the general command, is no addition to the Rule, &c.*

It is very true, if there be a *conformity to the general command*; but if you will undertake, (as here you implicitely aſſert) to prove that the *Forms of Prayer, Ceremonies, Prelacy, Re-ordination, Abjuration of the Covenant* (all which are impoſed upon us) are all of them but *particulars conformable to the general command of God*; Sir, let us but have the liberty of the Preſs, and you ſhall ſoon find one that will anſwer you. I ſuppoſe there are but few pious Conformiſts in *England* that will juſtifie the caſting of about two thouſand Miniſters out of their work, becauſe they could not ſubmit to theſe Impoſitions in the matters of God; had it been in things concerning the Commonwealth, that had been another caſe, then let him blame us. Whence we are quite miſtaken in Dr. *Templer*.

A

A POSTSCRIPT to the Reverend Dr. STILLINGFLEET.

SIR,

THE former pages were printed off ſooner than I was aware of; but give me leave to add theſe lines to clear my ſelf from that ſin of *Schiſm* with which you charge me among my Brethren, a little further; ſince I ſtill continue the ſame love and honourable reſpects to you.

"Three caſes there are you tell us, p. 213. in which the "Sripture allows of Separation, 1. *Idolatrous worſhip.* "2. *Falſe doctrine impoſed.* 3. *Indifferent things made neceſ-* "*ſary to ſalvation* [of this latter one word by and by]. "*But there are two others wherein* Paul *gives particular di-* "*rections, but ſuch as do not amount to ſeparation*, viz. 1. *Dif-* "*ferent opinions about* meats and drinks, *obſervation of* Jew- "iſh Holy-days. *In theſe points he adviſes not to cenſure one* "*another*, but notwithſtanding this difference, join together "as Chriſtians in the duties common to them all. *Thus you.*

A. Sir, This is very true: accordingly as I meet with Chriſtians of different apprehenſions, *Epiſcopal*, *Presbyterian*, *Independent*, *Anabaptiſts* (ſome few of which I have found, ſober men, and ſound in all points but that), let theſe men be found in the faith, and walk with a Goſpel-converſation, ſubjecting to Church-government, though in their different ways, I give the *Lords Supper* to them *all*, refuſing communion with none for theſe opinions.

2. But my good Brother, are you not beſide the que-

ſtion? *Did they in thoſe duties which were common to them all as Chriſtians, impoſe ſuch things as the Lord never impoſed, as terms of Communion?* This is our caſe, both in *Prayer, Baptiſm, Lords Supper, Diſcipline, which are duties common to us all*; in all theſe you impoſe your *own inventions*, not our *Lords injunctions*, ſo did not they.

And what if they would impoſe their *Jewiſh Holydays* (which yet were once *Gods own* appointment) upon the *Gentiles* to obſerve them, who knew they were abrogated? Sir, you impoſe *Holydays of mens appointing* upon us, which is far worſe; God's Authority is higher than yours.

2. The ſecond thing you mention, is the *corrupt lives of men in the Church*, &c. where you explain 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. *No, not to eat*; but Sir, I prefer your *Hammond's* explication, to which I refer the *Reader*; ſee his Pararaph and his Note.

As to that third ground which may warrant ſeparation, you ſay, viz. *The impoſing of things indifferent as neceſſary to our ſalvation.*

A. Sir, is *our ſalvation* all that we ſhould regard? Is not the *glory and honour of God* a thing to be attended? Is not this glory and honour of his, the firſt thing to be intended in his Worſhip? Is it not his honour when his *Soveraignty and Wiſdom* alone commands in his Worſhip? In caſe he be deprived of his Worſhip, is this honour to him? Sir, you make your Inventions, though in themſelves indifferent, yet being commanded by mans Authority, *to alter in ſome ſort their natures* (they are the words of your Canon upon the Croſs) and ſo *neceſſary* you make them, that *without theſe* God ſhall have no worſhip at all. Witneſs *Bartholmew-day.*

As to the *Liturgy* which you impoſe, you tell us, p. 332. you will ſay nothing, Dr. *Falkner* having ſo well defended it.

A. I know it is imputed to our *pride* and *conceitedneſs of our own gifts*, that we uſe it not. Sir, I do profeſs in words of ſobriety, if you, or Dr. *Falkner* can aſſure me infalli-

bly,

bly, that I ſhould be pleaſing to God, and that I ſhould diſcharge my Office as I ought, only by reading *Forms* of Prayer, I will be as *ready* to uſe nothing but *Forms*, as you are *ready* and *reſolute* to impoſe them; I would uſe alſo that *Form* of prayer *before my Sermon*, which your 55*th Canon* does *command to be uſed before Sermon*; and ſo nothing but *Forms*, which is the ſenſe of your Church. I ſay, may I be but as pleaſing to God. My reaſon is, I obſerve it would very much pleaſe my *corrupt*, *lazy*, *unbelieving* heart. I ſhould not need then to beg of God the preſence of his Spirit to help me as to the *matter* of prayer; nor need I act my faith and dependance upon him as conſcious of my own *inſufficiency*, 2 Cor. 3. 5. for all my prayer is prepared to a ſyllable. I ſhould not then labour with my proud heart to ſubmit quietly to Gods pleaſure, though he doth ſubſtract, and not afford that preſence ſometimes, which he doth at other times. For here are the ſame words and ſyllables at all times, his abſence or preſence hath no room here. It may be the *Friendly Debater* that can jeer, I ſee, at *Chriſtian experiences*, will jeer at me too, becauſe I give this experience of my corrupt heart; but I care not.

As for Dr. *Falkner*, let but the Queſtion be truly ſtated, and I do not find one Scripture-argument he hath brought that concludes the Queſtion: for his *own humane* reaſons, I little regard them in *divine Worſhip*.

As for private Chriſtians, I know your Clergy look on them as the Phariſees did upon the vulgar, *Joh.* 7. 49. but, Sir, I know more of them than *you*, or Dr. *Falkner*; plain Mechanicks have I known well Catechiſed, and humble Chriſtians excellent in practical piety, kept their ſtation, did not aſpire to be Preachers, but for gifts of prayer, few Clergy-men muſt come near them. I profeſs I fall ſhort of them. I have known ſome of them when they did keep their Faſts (as they did often) they divided the work of Prayer; the firſt began with *Confeſſion*; the ſecond went on with *Petition* for *themſelves*; the third Petition for

Church and Kingdom, &c. the fourth, *Thanksgiving*, every one kept to his own part, and did not meddle with anothers part. Such excellent matter ſo compacted without Tautologies, each of them for a good time, about an hour, if not more apiece, to the wondering of thoſe who joyned with them. Such anſwers of prayer I have known to others, that they have praiſed God for aſſurance that he had heard them before they roſe off their knees, and at that time it was done; a thing of very great conſequence, but heard not of it till two days after. Here was no reading of Liturgies; theſe were old *Jacobs* ſons, could wreſtle and prevail with God; and yet muſt be puniſhed if they came not to Church, and ſet above an hour in the cold to hear a Miniſter read that which their boys could do at home: and bleſſed be God that *England* in this dark day hath many thouſands of ſuch plain, but praying Chriſtians, however deſpiſed and puniſhed.

As for that Queſtion, *Whether every particular Congregation makes a particular Church?* which you deny, and oppoſe the Diſſenters, p. 234. &c. I pray, Sir, why do you not anſwer Mr. *Alſop*'s Text which he brings p. 45. from 1 *Cor.* 11. 18. compared with 20. that Text deſerves an anſwer; and till that be done, they are not confuted; you have left out the ſtrongeſt Argument.

Sir, you muſt ſtate the Queſtion a little cloſer, elſe you will not carry it. I doubt not but there may be one particular Congregation which may be inveſted with the power, and execute all the power of the keys, and I think that is a Church. For inſtance, take your *own* Congregation, and a few more in *London*, where four or five thouſand meet to worſhip God, ſo large are your places, with Galleries alſo. I would ſuppoſe in ſuch a Congregation there would be required four *Teaching* Elders, four *Ruling* Elders (Sir, I muſt own that Officer, though I think there hath been an error in aſſigning him that power which is not due to him) and four *Deacons*. Let all theſe Officers ply their work as hard

as

as they will, I doubt not but they will find their hands full and hearts full too, unleſs the Four thouſand be the better Chriſtians. But Sir, will you deny this Congregation to be ſuch a Church as we read of in the Goſpel, compleat as to exerciſe of all the power of the keys? I am ſure you will not.

As for your Reaſon for *Epiſcopal Government* [another ground of difference between us] which you give us in your *Preface*, pag. 5. quoting Mr. *Noyes of New-England* in your Treatiſe, *pag.* 234. agreeing with you, *viz. It is hard to perſwade conſidering men, that the Chriſtian Church ſhould degenerate ſo ſoon, ſo unanimouſly, ſo univerſally*, &c.--*Mr. Noyes*--*Would not Elders, ſo many knowing men, at leaſt ſome of them have contended for Truth, wherein their own Liberties were ſo much intereſſed?* Aerius *his oppoſing of Biſhops ſo long after their riſe and ſtanding, is inconſiderable*, &c.

Sir, much here might be ſaid, but I leave it to thoſe, with whom you have to deal; as for Mr. *Noyes*, I know him very well, and know what may cauſe him to write for Epiſcopal Government. That πρῶτον ψεῦδος (bear with my words, for I am ſure it is contrary to Scripture and Reaſon) of the Congregational men, *That the Fraternity* (or *Plebs*) *is the firſt ſubject of the power of the keys*, have made ſuch work in Congregational Churches to my knowledg, that their Elders have felt the need of that principle, and made them to think again.

But good Brother, what Epiſcopacy is it you mean? if you mean only *Epiſcopus Præſes*, I am of your opinion, it was the government in the Apoſtles time when Elders in a particular Church were multiplied: And if we would but exerciſe more meekneſs and patience one with another, Conſult the Scriptures more attentively, we ſhall find that the true Government and Conſtitution of the Church takes in ſomthing of *Epiſcopacy*, ſomthing of *Preshytery*, ſomething of *Independency*.

But Sir, if you mean *Epiſcopus Princeps*, (which is *our* Caſe)

Case) one that hath a Superiority of power above *Presbyters*, with which *these* must not meddle, and this Bishop such large *Dioceſs* as *ours* are, and this Bishop also the *Sole Paſtor* over the Dioceſs, as Bishop *Morley* checking Mr. *Baxter*, *tells him, that the Biſhop of* Worceſter, *and not* Mr. *Baxter, is Paſtor of* Kidderminſter, *as well as of all other* Parochial Churches *in that Diocæſi*, pag. 2. Sir, this *Epiſcopacy* you and Mr. *Noyes* have to prove, that it was ever in the Apoſtles time, or of Chriſts inſtitution, for this we utterly deny.

The *Preſidential Epiſcopacy* (as I may term it) laſted, as it is conceived by Learned men, till the middle of the ſecond Century, or towards the end of it: your ſelf does not deny it. *Iren.* pag. 275, 276.

But for this *Princely Epiſcopacy*, when that began to be ſet up, then began the Degeneracy of the Apoſtolical Government.

Though Mr. *Noyes* makes little of *Aerius*, yet *Medina* tells the world that *Jerome*, *Auſtin*, *Ambroſe*, *Sedulius*, *Primaſius*, *Chryſoſtom*, *Theodore*, *Theophilact*, were all of *Aerius* his judgment: and you ſay *Medinas* judgment will prove true, *Iren.* 276. So ſay *Biſhop Jewel* and Learned *Whitaker*. *Quam* Epiphanius *frigidiſſimis rationibus refellit*, ſaith *Whitaker*, Tom. 1. *pag.* 149.

As for their *Dioceſſes*, beſide what I have ſaid before, *you* tell us they were not very large, *ſince all the Pariſhes could communicate on the ſame day with what was ſent from the Cathedral Church. Iren.* pag. 370. Sure I am what you plead for now, does not agree with the laſt Paragraph of your *Irenicum*, where you were nearer the Truth.

How they ſhould come to degenerate ſo ſoon, is eaſily underſtood if we believe the 2 *Theſ.* 2, 3, 4, and 7. *ver.* and the 17. *Chap.* of the *Revelation*. If *poſitâ permiſſione infallibiliter ſequitur quod permittitur*, which I am ſure is true; then it is as true, if the *Spirit* foretels what ſhall come to paſs, that muſt come to paſs. good *Auſtin*, good *Cyprian*, and other good Biſhops, by their Superiority of power and large Dioceſſes,

cesses, did prepare the way for wicked *Boniface* the third, and he made the *Catholick Church* his Diocess: it was impossible for him else to come there, had the Churches kept to the Apostolical Government.

That Counsel and prediction of God was secretly and severely brought about by men. Though the Elders had *equal power from Christ*, yet being it was to be exercised but in a co-ordinate way with others, you tell us they *might devolve the exercise of their power to others*, *Iren.* 276. and Dr. *Templer* tells us, *there is a greater probability of an Union of Judgment, when all within a certain precinct lie under an obligation to be determined by the reason of One*, &c. when there is only matter of *Right and Liberty*, which require *care*, *pains*, *watch*, but no *profit* or *gain*, come into the *Purse* (as here) we can easily, and readily listen to Reason that may take us off from *Duty*, and part with that *Right* which hath no *profit*, but only *pains* annexed to it.

This was once your your Opinion, Ire. *pag.* 197 198.

FINIS.